







# Mainspring

the story of human progress  
and how NOT to prevent it



# MAINSRING

the grassroots story of human progress,  
what it means to you and me and  
how *NOT* to prevent it

Based on the general theme of Rose Wilder Lane's book "The Discovery of Freedom"—retold in condensed form by Henry Grady Weaver and augmented with other material. While this was done with Mrs. Lane's gracious consent, she should not be blamed for deviations, omissions and additions.

See page 230.

Illustrated by Robert F. Irwin

TALBOT  BOOKS  
6432 CASS AVENUE  
DETROIT 2, MICHIGAN

**“I realize that America is far from perfect,  
but in recent years the negative side has been  
so much overstressed that I make no apologies  
for concentrating on the doughnut  
instead of the hole.”**

**—*h. g. w.***

**COPYRIGHT 1947 BY**

**TALBOT BOOKS—DETROIT, MICHIGAN. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**

**Printed in the United States of America**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
<b>PART ONE – COMPARISONS &amp; CONTRASTS</b>	
1. Puzzling Questions . . . . .	1
2. The Great Multiplier . . . . .	11
3. Networks and Pitfalls . . . . .	15
 <b>PART TWO – THE OLD WORLD VIEWS</b>	
4. The Pagan View . . . . .	22
5. Socialism and (or) Communism	28
6. The Living Authorities, Etc. .	38
7. The Static Center . . . . .	47
 <b>PART THREE – THE REVOLUTION</b>	
8. The First Attempt . . . . .	59
9. Compromise . . . . .	68
10. The Second Attempt . . . . .	79
11. Prelude to Third Attempt . .	107
12. The Early Beginnings . . . . .	123
13. Roots of Revolution . . . . .	139
14. The Unknown Individual . . . .	151
15. The New Model . . . . .	162
16. Unplanned Planning . . . . .	170
17. The Revolution Spreads . . . .	174

## PART FOUR – FRUITS OF FREEDOM

18. Inventive Progress . . . . .	180
19. Hope <i>versus</i> Fear . . . . .	204
20. Material and Moral . . . . .	219
21. Freedom <i>versus</i> War . . . . .	226

## APPENDIX

Author's Notation . . . . .	230
Bibliography . . . . .	231
A Word About the Type . . . . .	234
Commercial . . . . .	235

PART ONE - CHAPTER 1

*puzzling questions of vital concern*  
**TO 2,150,000,000 INDIVIDUALS**



*For sixty known centuries this planet that we call the earth has been inhabited by human beings not much different from ourselves. Their desire to live has been just as strong as ours. They have had at least as much physical strength as the average person of today and among them have been men and women of great intelligence.*

*But down through the ages, most human beings have gone hungry and many have always starved.*

The ancient Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians and Greeks were intelligent people, but in spite of their fertile lands, they were never able to get enough to eat. They often killed their babies because they couldn't feed them.

The Roman Empire collapsed in famines. The French were dying of hunger when Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States. As late as 1846 the Irish were starving to death and no one was particularly surprised, because famines in the Old World were the rule rather than the exception. It is only within the last century that western

Europeans have had enough food to keep them alive—*soup and bread in France, fish in Scandinavia, beef in England.*

Hunger has always been normal. Even to this day famines kill multitudes in China, India, Africa and in the 1930's thousands upon thousands starved to death on the richest farmlands of the Soviet Union.

Down through the ages, countless millions, struggling unsuccessfully to keep bare life in wretched bodies, have died young in misery and squalor.

*Then suddenly, in one spot on this planet, people eat so abundantly that the pangs of hunger are forgotten.*

*Why did men die of starvation for six thousand years?*

*Why is it that we in America have never had a famine?*

Why did men walk, and carry goods and other men on their straining backs for six thousand years – then suddenly, on only a small part of the earth's surface, the forces of nature are harnessed to do the bidding of the humblest citizen?

Why did families live for six thousand years in caves and floorless hovels, without window or chimney; then, within a few generations – we in America take floors, rugs, chairs, tables, windows, chimneys for granted and regard electric lights, refrigerators, running water, porcelain baths and toilets as common necessities?

Why did men, women and children eke out their meagre existence – toiling desperately from dawn to dark, barefoot, half naked, unwashed, unshaved, uncombed, with lousy hair, mangy skins and rotting teeth, for six thousand years, then suddenly, in one place on earth we find an abundance of such things as rayon underwear, nylon hose, shower baths, safety razors, ice cream sodas, lipsticks and permanent waves?

*It's incredible – if we would but pause to reflect!*

**S**WIFTLY, in less than a hundred years, Americans have conquered the darkness of night – from pine knots and candles to kerosene lamps, to gas jets, then electric bulbs, neon lights, fluorescent tubes.

We have created wholly new and astounding defenses against weather – from fireplaces to stoves, furnaces, automatic burners, insulation, air conditioning.

We are conquering pain and disease, prolonging life and resisting death itself – with anaesthetics, surgery, sanitation, hygiene, dietetics.

We have made stupendous attacks on space: from ox carts, rafts and canoes – to railroads, steamboats, street-cars, subways, automobiles, trucks, busses, airplanes – and attacks on time through telegraph, telephone, and radio.

We have moved from back-breaking drudgery into the *modern age of power*, substituting steam, electricity and gasoline for the brawn of man – and today the nuclear-physicist is taking over and finding ways for subduing to human uses the infinitesimal tininess within the structure of the atom – tapping a new source of power so vast that it bids fair to dwarf anything that has gone before !

It is true that many of these developments had their origin in other countries. But new ideas are of little value in raising standards of living *unless* and *until* something is done about them and the plain fact is that we in America have outdistanced the world in extending the benefits of inventions and discoveries to the vast majority of people in all walks of life.

## HOW DID IT HAPPEN ?

Three generations – grandfather to grandson – have created these wonders surpassing the utmost imaginings of all previous time.

*How did it come about ?*

*How can it be explained ?*

Just what has been responsible for this unprecedented burst of progress which has so quickly transformed a hostile wilderness into the most prosperous and advanced country that the world has ever known?

Maybe the best way to find the answer is first to rule out some of the factors that were NOT responsible:

***To say that it's because of our natural resources is hardly the answer.***

The same rich resources were here back when the mound builders held forth. Americans have had no monopoly on iron, coal, copper, aluminum, zinc, lead or other materials. Such things have always been available to human beings. China, India, Russia, Africa, all have great natural resources. Crude oil oozed from the earth in Baku four thousand years ago – and when Julius Caesar marched west into Gaul, Europe itself was a rich and virgin wilderness inhabited by a few roving savages much the same as here in America when the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth.\*

***Is it because we work harder?***

Again the answer is “NO” because in most countries the people work much harder on the average than we do.

***Can it be that we are a people of inherent superiority?***

That sounds good in after-dinner oratory and goes over big at election time, but the argument is dif-

---

\*

Really, when you come right down to it, nothing is a “natural resource” until *after men have made it useful to human beings*. Coal was not a “natural resource” to Julius Caesar, nor crude oil to Alexander the Great, nor aluminum to Ben Franklin, nor the atom to anyone until 1945. Men may discover uses for any substance. Nobody can know today what may be a “natural resource” tomorrow. It is not natural resources, but *the uses men make of natural resources* that really count.

difficult to support. *Down through the centuries our ancestors, including the Anglo-Saxons, have starved right along with every one else.*

**Can it be that we have more energy than other peoples of the world?**

That's not the answer either, *but it's getting pretty close!*

We are not endowed with any superior energy – either mental or physical – but it is a fact that we, in these United States of America, have made more effective use of our human energies than any other people on the face of the globe – anywhere or at any time.

**That's the answer – the *real* answer – the *only* answer.**

It's a very simple answer – maybe too simple to be readily accepted. So it's the purpose of this book to dig beneath the surface and try to find the *reasons underlying the reason.*

In other words, just why does human energy work better here than anywhere else?

And to answer that question leads us into a whole string of questions, such as:

1. What is the *nature* of human energy?
2. How does it *differ* from other forms of energy?
3. *What makes it work?*
4. What are the things that *keep it from working?*
5. How can it be made to work *better* – more *efficiently* – more *effectively*?

The answers, or even the *partial* answers to these questions should be extremely helpful in contributing to future progress.

In the last analysis, poverty, famine and the devastations of war, are all traceable to a lack of understanding of human energy – and a failure to use it to the best advantage.

History affords abundant evidence in support of that statement, but the evidence is somewhat obscured because most of the text books *stress war and conflict* rather than the *causes of war* and *what might be done to prevent war*. \*

In later chapters we'll attempt to reverse the usual procedure. In other words, we'll try to see what can be learned from history as bearing on the *effective* use of human energy in advancing progress – as against the *MIS-USE* of human energy which retards progress and leads to the destruction of life as well as wealth.

But as a background for the main text of this book it seems necessary, first of all, to review a few elementary facts – including a lot of things that we already know – but which we are inclined to overlook.

First let's consider this general subject of energy – *human* versus *non-human*.

**This entire planet is made up of energy.  
The atoms of air surrounding it are energy.  
The sun pours energy upon this air and upon  
this earth. Life depends on energy – in fact,  
life IS energy.**

Every living thing must struggle for its existence and human beings are no exception. The thin defenses of civilization tend to obscure the stark realities, but men and women survive on this earth only because their energies constantly convert other forms of energy to human needs and constantly attack the *non-human* energies that are dangerous to their existence.

Some people are keenly aware of this: Doctors and nurses,

---

\* From a standpoint of military history, I guess it's important to know that the Battle of Bull Run came ahead of Vicksburg, but Margaret Mitchell's "Gone With the Wind" is far more revealing as bearing on the causes and effects of the War Between the States.



farmers, sailors, construction engineers, weather forecasters, telephone linemen, airplane pilots, railroad men, sand hogs, miners – all the fighters who protect human life and keep the modern world existing.

Such people stand the brunt of the struggle, and enable the rest of us to forget.

But it's important that we do not forget because when we *do* forget there is the temptation to indulge in wishful thinking and build imaginative Utopias, on the basis of things as we might like them to be instead of facing the real human situation and reckoning with things *as they are*.

In the last analysis, there are no shortcuts except along lines of making more effective use of our individual energies, personal initiative and imaginative abilities – applied to the things and forces of nature.

**B**UT let's get away from the broad generalities for a moment and take a "close-up" of human energy actually at work.

Right now you are reading this book. Let's say you want to turn a page. You are the dynamo that generates the energy to turn the page. Your brain-energy makes the decision and controls the movement of the *muscle-pulleys* and *bone-levers* of your arm, your hand and your fingers, and you turn the page.

The energy that you used to turn the page is the same kind of energy that created this book. From the first maker of paper, of ink, of type – down through centuries of Time, and across Space, from miners digging coal and iron in Pennsylvania, woodsmen sinking their axes into spruce in Norway and Oregon, chemists in laboratories, workers in factories and foundries, mechanics, printers, binders – every act of innumerable minds and hands that created this book and delivered it to you, was an operation of human energy generated and controlled by the person who performed the act.

And that's really short-changing the story. To make it complete we'd have to go back to the thousands of people who invented the tools – not just the paper making machinery, nor the printing presses and binding equipment, but the tools that were used to make all these things – *plus the tools that were used to make the tools.*

As a result of modern equipment and facilities, the amount of human time required to produce this book and deliver it to you was less than an hour – whereas a few hundred years ago it would have taken months.

It all comes back to the effective use of human energy – and human energy like any other energy operates according to certain natural laws.

For one thing, it works *only* under its own natural control.

Your decision to turn the page released the energy to turn it. It was your will that controlled the use of that energy. Nothing else *can* control it.

It's true of course that many of your actions are the result of *suggestions, requests or orders and commands* from others – but that doesn't change the fact that the decision to act and the action itself are always under your own control.

***Let's take an extreme case:***

A robber breaks into your house and threatens you at the point of a gun. Discretion being the better part of valor, you give in and tell him where your valuables are hidden. But it's *YOU* that makes the decision and it's *YOU* that does the telling.

If, instead of a robber, it was a kidnaper after your child, it would be a different story. But in either case your thoughts and acts are under your own control. Thousands of men and women have suffered torture and even death without speaking a word that their persecutors tried and failed to make them speak.

Your *freedom* of action may be forbidden, restricted or prevented by force. The robber, kidnaper or jailer may bind your hands and feet and put a gag in your mouth. But no amount of force can *make* you act unless you agree to do so – maybe with hesitation and regret, but the fact remains.

I know this all sounds hair-splitting and academic, but it leads to a very important point – in fact *two* important points:

1st *Individual freedom is the natural heritage of each living person.*

2nd *Freedom cannot be separated from Responsibility.*

Your natural freedom, your control over your own life energy was born in you along with life itself. It is a part of life itself.

It's not something that somebody can give you or that you can give to someone else. Nor can you hold any other person responsible for your acts. Control simply can't be separated from responsibility because *control IS responsibility.*

## RESULTS *versus* DESIRES

***A steam engine will not run on gasoline – nor will a gasoline engine run on steam.***

To use any kind of energy effectively it's necessary, first, to understand the *nature* of the energy – then set up conditions that will permit it to work to the best advantage.

To make the most effective use of steam energy it is necessary to reckon with the *nature* of steam. To make the most effective use of human energy it is necessary to reckon with the nature of *man*. And there's no escaping the fact that human energy *operates very differently from any other energy.*

Steam energy always acts in exactly the same way – so long as the conditions are the same. Ditto gasoline energy and electrical energy.

Insects and animals follow certain *patterns* of action. Honey bees for example, all make the same hexagonal cells of wax. Beavers all build the same form of dam, and the same kinds of birds make the same kinds of nests. Generation after generation, down through aeons of time; they continue to follow their changeless routines – always doing the same things in the same ways.

But man is different because he is a human being and *as* a human being he has the power of reason, the power of imagination – the ability to capitalize the experiences of the past and the present as bearing on the problems of the future. He has the ability to change *himself* as well as his environment. He has the ability to progress and *keep on progressing*.

Plants occupy *space* and contend with each other for it. Animals defend their possession of places and things.

But man has enormous powers, of unknown extent, to make *new* things and to change *old things into new forms*.

He not only *owns* property, but he actually *creates* property.

***In the last analysis, a thing is not property unless it is owned, and without ownership there is little incentive to improve it.***

## CHAPTER 2

# The Great Multiplier



*Through foresight, imagination and individual initiative, man develops tools and facilities that expand his efforts and enable him to produce things that would not otherwise be possible. This is an outstanding difference between man and animal – just as it is an outstanding difference between civilization and barbarism.*

Progress toward better living would never have been possible except through the development of tools to extend the uses of human energy – *and tools that harness the forces of nature as a substitute for muscular effort.*

The American Economic Foundation puts it in terms of the mathematical equation:

$$MMP = NR + HE \times T$$

– which is just a shorthand way of saying that “MAN’S MATERIAL PROGRESS *depends on* NATURAL RESOURCES *plus* HUMAN ENERGY *multiplied by* TOOLS.”

That’s a neat way to express it and the formula is worth remembering. But no amount of mathematics can ever tell the *real* story.

Let's go back about 500,000 years and look in on one of our Stone Age ancestors. Here, squatting in front of his cave is a man with a new idea. He's one of the *real pioneer inventors*.

He's on the verge of inventing the first tool – or *almost* the first tool. Clubs had long been used for fighting – and sharp, jagged stones had probably been used for cutting and hacking.


But our neolithic genius is going to *combine* the two ideas by fastening a sharp stone onto the end of a club or a handle, thus increasing the momentum and the force of impact. He's going to *create a new tool – a crude sort of an ax*.

All he's got to start with is the general idea and the raw materials – *plus the energy and the will power to do a job*.

Without any tools to start with, it's going to take about a week of steady work – except that he won't be able to work on it steadily. He'll have to take time out to hunt for his food.

Maybe he could get somebody else to do that for him, but it's rather doubtful because, mind you, this is back in the early Stone Age and it seems reasonable to assume that the general practice of exchanging goods and services came *after* the invention of tools.

Of course if he'd been sick and unable to forage for his own food the others might have understood and helped him. But for a strong healthy man to waste his time fooling around with sticks and stones, was downright lunacy. He should have been out hunting birds' eggs or catching lus-



cious grasshoppers, or indulging in a spree down near the river bank where the ground was covered with slightly fermented mulberries.

So instead of anyone bringing him food it's more likely that his family and friends just laughed at him.

Aided and abetted by the witch doctors, they may have gone so far as to sabotage his early efforts.

The same sort of things had probably happened to his forerunners. Maybe that's why the making of an ax had been so long delayed. Surely, down through the millions of years the same idea must have occurred to lots of others.

But right now we are talking about the fellow who had the tenacity to buck the tide of public opinion and get the job done.

Of course after the ax is finished things will take a different turn. He'll be able to demonstrate the advantages and from then on he can swap the loan of his ax for food, furs and feathers. Maybe he'll be able to put his whole time on the making of more axes and better axes and there's lots of room for improvement.

The first crude ax was nothing to brag about, but it was an important forward-looking step and it typifies the kind of thinking that sets man completely apart from the animals, the insects, the birds and the bees.

It doesn't take much imagination to see how the invention of this first crude hand tool led to the development of other tools – and to the creation of various other things such as rafts, houses, wheels, etc., but the main point is,

➡ *Multipled by*



that the introduction of tools marked the beginning of man's progress in three important directions:

1. More effective use of energy.
2. Specialization of effort.
3. Advances in human cooperation and improvements in living conditions, through the peaceful exchange of goods and services.


Also, the introduction of tools brought into sharper focus the importance of individual property rights. Unless a person has a chance of gaining some direct benefits from his extra efforts, there's not much inducement to think ahead and make the sacrifices that are necessary to provide the tools of production. *And without the tools of production human beings would sink back into a state of barbarism.*

*We have moved a long way from the Stone Age, and today almost every one depends for his welfare – even for his very life – on exchanges of ownership.*



## CHAPTER 3

# Networks and Pitfalls



*The modern world is an intricate network of living human energies linking all persons in cooperative effort and in one common fate. The Turk has bread because the American smokes cigarettes. New Yorkers eat pineapple ripened in Hawaii because the Burmese mine tin. We drink coffee at breakfast because Brazilians need our iron, machinery and wheat. And Japanese babies grow strong and healthy when American women buy silk lingerie.*

This is the kind of world that men and women naturally want to live in. And it is the kind of world they begin to create when they are free to use their individual energies and free to cooperate among themselves – *voluntarily*.

Thus the brotherhood of man is not an ideal of *selflessness* which human beings are too sinful to achieve. It is stern reality. All persons are bound together in the one imperative desire to survive on this earth.

“Do unto others as you would have them do unto you” is not only a sound moral precept – it is the hardheaded advice of practical self-interest. Whoever injures another, injures himself because he decreases the opportunity for gains that come through cooperation and exchange.

*But how can we reconcile the principle of cooperation with the conflicts of competition?*

The answer is that there is nothing inconsistent between the two:

Competition is the practical manifestation of human beings in free control of their individual affairs, arriving at a balance in their relationships with one another.

Free competition is within itself a cooperative process.

Competitive bargaining, for example, is essential to equitable transactions:

The buyer wants a lower price. The seller wants a higher price. This may give rise to conflict and argument. But the temporary period of debate that may precede the exchange of goods and services is in no sense contradictory to the cooperative relationships which underlie the whole idea of exchange. Nor are the conflicts and rivalries of opposing viewpoints confined to the market place. They are found in the home, the church, the club, the schoolroom, the playground – *everywhere*.

## ETERNAL DILEMMA

Since the uses of human energy are innumerable and because of wide variations in tastes and desires – individual persons left to their own volition, rarely choose to do the same things, in the same way, at the same time.

All friends, lovers, playmates, family groups, business associates, have experienced the dilemma in varying degrees: *Shall we stay at home or go to the movies? Shall we listen to the symphony or the soap opera? Shall we plant alfalfa or peanuts? Shall we buy or build this or that?*

Life is a continuous series of conflicts and compromises and, generally speaking, the cooperative actions growing out of such conflicts and compromises are sounder than if each one of us were able to carry out his own ideas, in his own way and without regard for anyone else.

But from the viewpoint of the individual, it sometimes appears that the efforts of others *are unnecessary obstacles to his own direct action in achieving his own personal desires.*

*Thus it occurs to him that maybe there should be some centralized control or overriding Authority to govern all human energies as a unit.*

This concept has a strong appeal because lurking beneath it is the alluring assumption that the *right kind* of Authority would direct the affairs of all mankind in harmony with the individual's own personal views – *thus relieving him of the trouble and responsibility of making his own ideas work.*

Just by way of illustration, suppose it's me that's got an idea – and while we're at it let's make it something *really big.*

Let's assume for example, that I've got a plan or a program that would (in my opinion) improve the lot of all mankind (and especially that portion of mankind that's in the same position as myself).

I'm completely sold on the virtues of my idea. But there are those who disagree. I get tired of trying to persuade them. There ought to be an easier and a quicker way. I'm feeling a bit frustrated, and in bolstering my ego, I forget that others are entitled to have different views. I conclude that coercion is the only way and I find comfort in the reassuring alibi that "*The end justifies the means.*"

But so much for the background and now let's eavesdrop while I lull my conscience and build up my own case in my own mind, *to wit:*

"No one can doubt my sincerity and I'm wholly unselfish in my motives – or at least *ALMOST* wholly unselfish.

"I don't stand to make any money out of it – at least *NOT MUCH* – and anyway the total benefits to others will far outweigh the benefits to me. Naturally

I'll get some honor and glory – but after all it *is* my idea.

“Those of my friends (who are in the same position as I am) understand all this and they agree with me – or at least *most* of them do.

“But what about these others – the ones who seem determined to block my efforts?

“It's true that my program would cost them a little money at the start, but in the long run *everybody* would be better off – including *them*.

“The trouble is that *they* are non-progressive and downright selfish. But they are not honest enough to come out and admit it.

“They contend that my plan has certain shortcomings.

“Well, *what of it?* Sure, there may be a few things that need to be ‘ironed out.’ But why not get started and worry about the details later on? The advantages would more than offset any minor defects and there's been too much delay already.

“This is the Atomic Age and the human race must no longer be deprived of the benefits that *I* am ready to bring them.

“Those who don't see the light must be *made* to see the light, and I'm not going to compromise my principles by giving in to a bunch of self-seeking reactionaries.

“They've got to be *forced* into line and that calls for government assistance. (There ought to be a law!) If we had the right kind of folks in government, they'd have stepped in and supported my cause long ago. That's what governments are for.

“What we need is a stronger government – run by men who would turn a deaf ear to the kind of folks who are blocking my program.

“There’s been too much compromising – too much dilly-dallying.

“It’s about time we had a new form of government – a more progressive government – run on truly democratic principles, but with enough power to get things under control and really do a job !

“Maybe we ought to have a dictator – *not a despot mind you*, but a truly beneficent dictator – one who would have the *real* interests of the *real* people at heart – one who was smart enough to run things the way *I* know they ought to be run.

“ – *and maybe, just to be on the safe side – maybe it ought to be ME !*”

That concludes the example. I agree that it’s a bit extreme – or to say the least it’s rather bluntly presented. Few people would *consciously* try to force the entire world into line with their own pet ideas.

But almost every individual, at one time or another, gets the feeling that there should be some kind of centralized Authority that would control human energies as a unit and “run things the way they *ought* to be run.”

There’s nothing new in the idea. Since the beginning of recorded history on down to (and through) the present time, it has captured the fancy of people everywhere and in all walks of life.

Of course, different individuals have different views as to just how things ought to be run – but the idea persists that there should be a unified control – and each proponent, in his own imagination and with the best of intentions, fondly visualizes the *kind* of control that would favor his or her own personal ideas.



## FOR 6,000 YEARS

Among the learned philosophers, the age old problem has been to determine just who (or what) *is* in control or *should* be in control of living persons.

From Plato to Spengler, the big question has been to identify the Authority – and turn over to it all the problems of the human race.

Down through centuries of time, every conceivable form of Authority has been tried but each has failed for the simple reasons that:

*Only an individual human being can generate human energy.*

*Only an individual human being can control the energy that he generates.*

The lack of understanding of these simple, basic truths has, for over 6,000 years, stagnated human progress and kept the vast majority of people underfed, underclothed, embroiled in wars, and dying from famine and pestilence.

## FOUNDATION OF FAITH

In the following chapters we will briefly review the various types of Authorities and try to appraise their results in terms of human good.

The best way to go at it, is first to consider the religious beliefs that underlie the different kinds of Authorities, political structures – or what is generally called *government*.

I am using the word “religious” in its broad sense, but I think it can be shown that any form of human organization – whether it be political, business or social – reflects the deep-seated faith of the people who organize it and keep it going.

Individuals direct their energies and build their organizations according to their views of reality – what they conceive to be desirable and good.

Every human act is preceded by a decision to act, and the decision is based on *faith*. You can't even think, without a deep-seated faith that you exist and that a Supreme Standard of Good exists in the universe. This is true of every living person – whether his God is the God of Abraham and Christ, Zeus or Isis, or Reason or Fate, or History or Astrology or any other God by any other name – whether It be true or false.

When the belief is false, then the result will be different from what was expected. But the fact remains that every action of every human being springs from the desire to attain something that he considers to be good – or else to avoid something that he thinks is evil, or undesirable.

Since the actions of any individual are determined by his or her beliefs, it follows that the *underlying control* of the energies of any group of persons, at any one time, is the religious faith that prevails among them at that time.

There are hundreds if not thousands of variations in religious faith, but, for purposes of this discussion, they may all be grouped under three general headings:

1. THE PAGAN VIEW – *fatalistic belief in the Mythical Gods, the Will-Of-The-Mass, the All-Powerful Earthly Ruler or Living Authority.*
2. THE NON-PAGAN VIEW – *as reflected in the Hebrew, the Christian and the Moslem faiths.*
3. COMPROMISES *between the two – as typified by the Feudal system.*

**Just what are the basic differences between these views? How do they affect the uses of human energy? What are the results in terms of progress – spiritual as well as material?**

***What does it mean to you and me as bearing on the present and the future?***

## The Pagan View



*The Pagan has a fatalistic outlook on life. He believes that the individual is helpless – that he is wholly at the mercy of relentless forces outside of himself – that there's nothing he can do to improve his lot.*

The vast majority of people on this earth have always been pagans. Most of them are still pagans. The superstition is deep-seated. It had its beginning back in prehistoric times.

Mythology tells how special gods were in charge of everything affecting human life. Some gods controlled thunder, some controlled lightning, some controlled rain. Others controlled the seasons, the bounty of the harvest, the multiplication of the flocks and the birth of children.

There were sun gods, love gods, gods of jealousy, gods of hatred and gods of war.

Whimsical and prankish gods looked after everything. All that man could do was to keep peace with them by making such sacrifices (human and otherwise) as were dictated by tribal custom.

### ANCIENT TO MODERN

In ancient times the pagan gods and goddesses were known by various names, such as Zeus, Isis, Osiris, Ur, Eros, Jupiter, Juno, Apollo, Venus, Mercury, Diana, Neptune, Pluto, Mars.

In modern times they are given more modern names but the underlying idea is the same.



From the pagan viewpoint man is *not* self-controlling – *not* responsible for his own acts. The pagan universe is timeless, changeless, static. There is no such thing as progress. Any apparent change is merely a human illusion. Man is passive. His place is fixed. He has no freedom of will. His fate is decreed. If he tries to resist, his efforts will be futile.

The pagan belief is similar to that of a very young child. The new-born babe has not yet learned how to control himself. He must be spanked before he can even breathe, and for a long time he will kick himself in the eye when he tries to taste his toes. He cannot get food; he is fed. He is uncomfortable, and he is turned over. Warmth, comfort, cleanliness, all are given to him by some power outside himself, enormously stronger than he. This power controls the *conditions* of his life, but *it does not control him*. *Did you ever try to stop a baby's squawling when he merely wanted to squawl?*

If babies were able to think and speak, no doubt any baby – all babies – would contend that some Great Power controls the lives of babies.

But babies grow up and in time the normal baby becomes a self-controlling, human being. Yet, throughout all history, down to and including modern times, *few adult persons have ever discovered that they are really free*.

Most human beings cling to the ancient superstition that they are not self-controlling and not responsible for their own acts.

For thousands of years, the majority has always believed that men are passive objects controlled by some superhuman or super-individual Authority – and for thousands of years, *people have gone hungry*.

One of the oldest if not *the* oldest form of pagan worship is based on the idea that human destiny is controlled by the overall Will-of-the-Tribe – rather than by the initiative and free will of the individual persons who make up the tribe.

It is true that human beings must exchange mutual aid

with each other, on this inhospitable and dangerous planet. Perhaps from a dim sense of this natural kinship – the brotherhood of man – savages in pre-historic times came to believe that they were governed by the spirit of Demos – a super-individual will of the “mass” of persons – endowed with omnipotent power and authority.

The welfare of this mystic Being is called “The common good,” which is supposed to be more important than the good of the individual, just as the health of a human body is more important than the life of any cell in it.

It is in this concept that we find the origin of human sacrifice to the pagan gods. No one hesitates to destroy the cells of the hair on his head, or of the nails on his fingers and toes. They are not important in themselves. Their only value is their use to the body as a whole. Thus, for that “common good” you sacrifice them without a moment’s thought or pity.

It is precisely in that spirit that the ancient Aztec priest thrust a knife into the human victim on the altar and, with holy incantations, tore out the beating heart. In that same spirit the Cretans sacrificed their loveliest daughters to the Minoan bull and the Carthaginians burned their living babies to placate the Great God Moloch.

Some insects actually do seem to be controlled by an Authority outside themselves. The honey-bee, for example, appears to be wholly lacking in self-faith and individual initiative. A “Will-of-the-Swarm” seems to control it. The bee’s life is exhausted in selfless, changeless toil for the common good. The Swarm itself seems to be the living creature. If the queen is taken away, a hundred thousand bees will die, just as a headless body dies.

The collectivists, ancient and modern, contend that human society should be set up like the bee-hive. In a way it’s an appealing concept – at least to the theorists – including the majority of the professional writers. It’s much simpler to assume that human beings “stay put” or that there should

be some overriding Authority that would make 'em stay put.

But to think that way is to think like a bee – *if a bee really thinks.*

The plain fact of the matter is that human beings – with their hopes and aspirations and the faculty of reasoning power – are very different from bees.

Man combines conscious curiosity with the lessons of experience and, when permitted to do so, makes the combination pay continuous dividends. In contrast to the lower animals, he includes himself and his social affairs within the scope of his curiosity.

Bees, down through the ages, continue to act like automata and keep on building the same little cells of wax. But human society is made up of unpredictable relationships between individual persons.

It is “boy meeting girl,” Mrs. Jones telephoning Mrs. Smith, Robinson buying a cigar, the motorist stopping for gas, the minister making his round of calls, the postman delivering mail, the lobbyist tipping the bellboy and meeting a congressman, the school child bargaining for bubble gum, the dentist saying, “*Wider, please!*” Society is the innumerable relationships of persons in their infinite variety, in space and in time.

*And what is the one constant element in all these relationships? Why does one person want to meet another person? What is the human purpose in society?*

It is to *exchange* one good for another good, more desired. Putting it on a personal basis, it is a matter of benefiting your *self* by getting something more desired from another person who, at the same time, benefits *himself* by getting something that he desires from you. The object of such contacts is the peaceful exchange of benefits, mutual aid, cooperation for each person's gain.

The incalculable sum of all these meetings is human society, which is simply all the individual human actions that express the brotherhood of man.

To discuss the welfare and responsibilities of society as an abstract whole – as if it were like a bee swarm – is an over-simplification and a fantasy. The real human world is made by persons, not by societies. The only human development is the self-development of the individual person.

***There is no short cut!***

But even today many civilized persons, nice people, cultured, gentle and kind, our friends and our neighbors – almost all of us at some time or another – have harbored the pagan belief that the sacrifice of individual persons serves a higher good. The superstition lingers in the false ideal of selflessness which emphasizes conformity to the Will-of-the-Mass – as against the Christian virtues of self-reliance, self-improvement, self-faith, self-respect, self-discipline and a recognition of one's *duties* as well as one's *rights*.

Such thinking is promoted under the banner of social reform but it gives rise to the tyrants of "Do-Goodism" – the Fuehrers, the Dictators, the overlords, who slaughter their own subjects – *the very people who looked to them for the more abundant life and for protection against harm.*

Today such killings are called "liquidation," "blood purge," "social engineering," but they are defended on the basis of Pagan barbarism – a sacrifice of the individual under the alibi of what is claimed to be the "common good."

**"HUMANITARIAN WITH THE GUILLOTINE" \***

In her discerning book "The God of the Machine" Isabel Paterson draws important distinctions between Christian kindness directed toward the relief of distress – and the misguided efforts of those who would make it a vehicle for self-aggrandizement.

She points out that most of the major ills of the world have been caused by well-meaning people who ignore the

---

\* Read Chapter XX of "The God of the Machine" by Isabel Paterson, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1943.

principle of individual freedom (except as applied to themselves) and who are obsessed with fanatical zeal to improve the lot of mankind in the mass through some pet formula that happens to please their fancy.


Although prompted by good intentions, such programs are usually the outgrowth of egomania fanned by self-hypnotism, as suggested back on page 17: *"I am right. Those who disagree are wrong. If they can't be forced into line they must be destroyed."*

Egotism is a natural human trait and a constructive trait when kept within bounds. But it is highly presumptuous on the part of any mortal man to assume that he is endowed with such fantastic ability that he can run the affairs of all his fellow men better than they, as individuals, can run their own personal affairs.

As Miss Paterson observes, the harm done by ordinary criminals, murderers, gangsters and thieves is negligible in comparison with the agony inflicted upon human beings by the professional "do-gooders" who attempt to set themselves up as gods on earth and who would ruthlessly force their views on all others - with the abiding assurance that "the end justifies the means."

*But it's a mistake to assume that they are insincere. The danger lies in the fact that their faith is just as devout and just as ardent as that of the ancient Aztec priest.*

## Socialism and or Communism



*The nearest approach to the beehive* is found in Socialism or Communism – whichever term you care to use. There's not much choice between the two. They both aim at world collectivism.

The only difference is a variation of viewpoint as to what tactics and procedures should be used to bring it about.

Up to 1917 the words Socialism and Communism were used as synonymous and interchangeable terms.

But incident to the Russian Revolution they began to be used to distinguish between the *Second International* and the *Third International*.

Perhaps we'd better go back a little earlier and briefly review the events that led to the present day confusion:

In the middle of the 19th century, a German named Karl Heinrich Marx, with the support of the wealthy Friedrich Engels, presented the ancient Will-of-the-Swarm superstition in modern dress, embellished with pseudo-scientific theories.

His voluminous writings included *The Communist Manifesto* (1847) and *Das Kapital* (1867).

This was during the period when the so-called industrial revolution was just beginning to make headway in lifting the burdens of heavy labor from the backs of mankind. But Marx misinterpreted the trend. He mistook the new tools of freedom as being tools of further oppression.

He contended that capitalism, under the machine age, would gobble up an increasing share of the wealth and that

the working man would be reduced to pitiable destitution unless all peoples of the world could be organized on a uniform socialistic basis.

It is interesting to note that as early as 1840, a brilliant young French economist had reached exactly the opposite conclusion. It was Frederic Bastiat who, through a mathematical formula of his own devising, predicted that under a free economy, laborers' share of the increasing wealth would move from 35% to 65%. That's exactly what has happened in the U. S. A. and, mind you, Bastiat made his prediction over one hundred years ago ! \*

But Marx and his followers were laboring under the Old World delusion of a static economy. It was inconceivable to them that changes in the techniques of production would bring far-reaching changes in other directions.

They believed that industrial capitalism was the natural forerunner of socialism – that the way to bring about the

\*

---

The story of Frederic Bastiat is much in contrast to that of Karl Marx. Bastiat earned his own living and paid his own way. He was a brilliant writer and his articles found a ready market. Just as the American Revolutionists were the first to accept the Christian principle of man's natural freedom as the foundation of political structure, Bastiat was first to apply the principle to economic analysis.

In contrast to Marx and Engels, he never forgot the spirit and soul of man and with hammer-blow logic, brightened with a high sense of humor, he drove home the doctrine of liberation and attainment *through individual effort*. But Bastiat was no match for the highly organized proponents of class-hatred and he was defeated at the polls in 1848. Exhausted by overwork and robbed of his voice by the death in his body, he continued to fight for two more years. Then in 1850, at the age of 49, he died of tuberculosis – a disease of malnutrition, *in a world that was only beginning to learn that hunger and disease are not the will of God*.

Frederic Bastiat might be described as the *Tom Paine of economics*. To date he has no successor and the carrying on of his work should be a challenge to some freedom-loving American of the younger generation.

Three of his brilliant and scintillating books are now available in English translations: "*Social Fallacies*" and "*Harmonies of Political Economy*" are published by The Register Publishing Co., Ltd., Santa Ana, Calif. "*The Law*" which was written just before his death is published in a paper back edition by Pamphleteers, Inc., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

world millenium was to concentrate, first of all, on highly developed capitalistic countries – using the processes of attrition, boring from within, fomenting dissension and class hatred and promoting collectivist measures through existing governmental agencies. (Something like jujitsu which has been described as a technique of defeating the opponent by turning his own strength against him.)

In other words, it was a program of “inducing capitalism to commit suicide” – then stepping in and taking things over.

The First International and the Second International Socialist parties were operated from that viewpoint.

But at a London conference in 1903, just twenty years after the death of Marx, a young Russian named Vladimir Ilich Ulianov (who later became known as Lenin) split the Russian section of the Second International on a question of tactics. The process of obtaining power through political maneuvers and infiltration was too slow for him.

Lenin insisted that, in the case of Russia, his professional terrorists could take over the government by force – without waiting for that country to pass through the stage of modern capitalism.

Incident to the Russian Revolution, Lenin and his followers set themselves up as the *Third International* – which came to be known as The Communist Party.

The shattered fragments of the Second International, including the British Labour Party, continue to call themselves Socialists.

But there is really no distinction between the Socialists and the Communists except from the standpoint of tactics in getting started, and that difference is less clearly defined than formerly because outside of Russia, The Third International uses either force or intrigue – or a combination of the two – depending on the circumstances, *whatever seems most propitious*.



Socialism and Communism, in fact all forms of collectivism, rest on the same Will-of-the-Swarm idea:

*the individual is nothing – the strength of  
the Party is the only thing that matters!*

### OBSTINATE FACT

Plutarch's account of ancient Sparta (600 B.C.) is an apt description of Communism as it is practiced today:

"Their discipline," reports Plutarch, "continued still, after they were grown men. No one was allowed to live after his own fancy, but the city was a sort of [military] camp, in which every man had his share of provisions and business set out. He [Lycurgus] bred up his citizens in such a way that they neither would, nor could, live by themselves; they were required to make themselves as one with the public good and, clustering like bees around their commander, be *all but* carried out of themselves by their zeal and public spirit." (The phrase "*all but*" is the obstinate difference between a man and a bee.)

For a hundred years or more, the Spartans lived their Spartan lives in changeless routine. When King Agis IV tried to raise their standard of living, they killed him. Finally their less-communistic neighbors defeated them in war, and ended the commune.

*But the idea of the bee-swarm still persists.*

### LAW OF LEK

"In the 1920's," reports Mrs. Lane, "I was visiting in the Dinaric Alps where the Dukhagija Tribes have lived in Communism since remote antiquity.

"In one of the villages a radically subversive woman was demanding a house. She and her husband had built the house. Now she was a widow but she wanted to keep the house. It was the usual one-room hovel of stones, without floor, window or chimney. Passionately attached to it and obstinately anti-social, she could not be silenced. She kept

on repeating vigorously the words that she had been repeating for weeks: *'With my hands, these hands, I built up the walls. With these hands I laid the roof-stones. It is my house. I want my house. With these hands I built the walls. . . .'*

"The tribesmen said, *'She is mad. A spirit not human has entered into her.'*

"I told them that in America a man (or woman) may own a house. They could not believe this because they admired America. They had heard of its many marvels; during the war they had seen airplanes from that fabulous land, and now before their eyes they saw Americans, fantastically rich – wearing shoes, khaki, sun-glasses, and owning notebooks, fountain pens and cigarets wrapped in shiny paper.

"Courteously they insisted that I must be mistaken. In America there must be order, security, stability; Americans surely have some law which could not permit anyone to keep a house all for himself.

"They questioned me shrewdly and I wrecked my argument by mentioning taxes. This seemed to admit that the *American Tribe* does own the house. I was completely routed but their high opinion of my country was restored.

"The whole conversation was foolishly superficial; it was their basic assumption that was false. They assumed that persons are not self-controlling and not responsible. To them the Tribe was the human unit, and individuals were no more than cells in it. They could not conceive that man's exercise of his natural functions, his human rights, could create a new kind of civilization, a true social order with greater economic abundance than men have ever before achieved on this planet."

### COLLECTIVISM *versus* FREEDOM

The practice of communism has not been confined to the Old World. The North American Mound Builders were probably communists; certainly the American Indians were communists and the Pilgrim Fathers established communism

on the *Mayflower* and attempted to operate *Plymouth* as a commune.

But they found themselves up against the stern realities of a frontier wilderness. Their theories were overshadowed by the facts of the situation. Their lives depended on applying their individual energies to the getting of food and shelter. Half of them starved during the first winter and the necessity for survival forced them to break up the commune and put each person on his own. They learned an important lesson and from then on they prospered.

But in later years and after the United States were formed, Americans and Europeans eagerly established communistic settlements from coast to coast.\*

One after another, these experiments have failed despite the fact that they were closely knit communities made up of fervent volunteers, who, generally speaking, were bound together by a common religious faith.

The founders die off. The younger generation can't help but notice what's going on in surrounding communities. The result is discontent and dissension.

When a communistic community is set up alongside a free economy the contrast is too great to be ignored.

A black sunbonnet was worn for 110 years in a certain Ohio commune. The sunbonnet still exists — the commune does not. The great granddaughters of the original founders are now wearing gay and modern hats.

---

\* Examples are: Hancock, Harvard, Shirley, Tryingham in Massachusetts; Alfred and New Gloucester in Maine; Mount Lebanon, Watervliet, Groveland, Oneida, (yes, Community Silver) in New York; South Union and Pleasant Hill in Kentucky; Bethlehem and Economy in Pennsylvania; Union Village, North Union, Watervliet, Whitewater, Zoar in Ohio; Wallingford and Enfield in Connecticut; Bishop Hill, Illinois; Amana, Iowa; Corning and Bethel in Missouri; Cedarvale, Kansas; Aurora, Oregon. In the flowering of New England, Emerson's friends created the communist blossom, Brook Farm. Mr. Upton Sinclair, recently an almost successful candidate for Governor of California, began his fight for a glorious new future by founding the short-lived commune of Halicon Hall, New Jersey.

Regardless of the theory of the thing, human energies simply do not function in the manner of the bee-swarm and the attempt to govern the actions of multitudes of men always results in the placing of oppressive power in the hands of the few.

Under Communism everything is run by the masses of people. At least that's the theory of the thing. But in actual practice it doesn't work out that way. There must be some strong person or small group of persons to sit in the saddle and stamp out any ideas that are opposed to the so-called common good – *as determined by the strong person or small group of persons.*

Thus in order to put the theories into practice, it is admittedly necessary to employ methods that are diametrically opposed to what Communism is supposed to represent – and the necessity becomes increasingly obvious when the attempt is made to extend Communism over a wide area.

In line with the teachings of Marx, the proponents admit the necessity but argue that it is merely a temporary measure – that the Dictatorship will automatically “*wither away*” just as soon as things get going. They contend that history decrees this “*withering away*” – but the facts don't bear out the theory. Down through all the ages there's no evidence of any dictatorship ever “*withering away.*” Dictatorship always feeds on itself. The ruthless tactics that are necessary to get it started become increasingly ruthless in the efforts to conceal the errors and defects of a scheme that can't be made to work.

Human energy and individual initiative are put in a strait-jacket and the inevitable result is poverty and distress leading into war. It may be internal rebellion or it may be war of aggression against other people. Those in power naturally prefer the latter course. It provides the opportunity to distract attention away from failures at home, with the alluring possibilities of taking wealth away from others – *and getting away with it.*

SINCE THE AIM OF COMMUNISM is economic equality and security, those in charge must, in line with the practice of Lycurgus, set things up as a military camp in which every man has his share of provisions and his business laid out for him.

Thereafter, no person can be permitted to live or work "after his own fancy" because that would not be Communism.

If some individual on his own initiative tries to act in a new way, to change living conditions – if, like King Agis IV, he tries to introduce money, or, like the woman in the Dukhagin, to have a whole hovel for himself when the commune was not planned on such a high economic level, or if in Amana, Iowa, in 1900 he had wanted to invent a motor car – he would have had to get the consent of his comrades and the chances are that they would not give their consent.

To let him have his way would endanger the faith that keeps the commune in existence.

## ARTIFICIAL RESPIRATION

In establishing a communistic state it is possible to take advantage of everything that has gone before and to borrow techniques and ideas from other countries. It is also possible to set up and maintain bureaus of scientists, research workers and inventors, under the control of the state.

But even under such a policy the communistic state will lag behind those countries in which the opportunity for free initiative extends to the entire population instead of to the chosen few.

It was the goal of the Soviet Dictators to industrialize Russia by bringing its production up to the American level of 1917. The program has continually lagged behind expectations despite the fact that it has been greatly aided by materials, techniques and personal services furnished by American industrialists and American engineers.

COMMUNISM, regardless of the trimmings, is an attempt to make a static world in a dynamic and changing universe.

To whatever degree it succeeds partially for a length of time it will be at the expense of progress. The scale of living will tend to remain at the same level as when the commune was first established.

There is abundant historical evidence in support of that statement and underlying such evidence is the indisputable fact that nothing but new and better ways of using human energy can raise a scale of living.

And since human energy is generated and controlled by individual persons, any new ways of using it must come from the individual efforts of the individual person to make something that does not now exist. (In a later chapter this will be discussed in considerable detail.)

## FACTS AND FALLACY

In all fairness it must be said that, in theory at least, communism recognizes the *human equality and brotherhood of man* – but it fails to recognize the *real nature of man*.

The communist has not yet seen the fallacy in the ancient, infantile assumption that individual persons are controlled by some super-individual Authority. He does not question this pagan superstition. He takes it for granted. To him, individuals are merely cells of a larger organism – the Tribe, the People, Society, the Mass.

Spartans called it "*Sparta*." The villagers of Dukhagin called it "*The Law of Lek*." Hegel and Treitschke called it "*The State*." Karl Marx called it "*Economic Necessity*." Lenin called it the "*Dictatorship of the Proletariat*." Mussolini called it "*Immortal Italy*." Hitler: "*The German Race*."

But regardless of what it may be called, it is the self-surrender of the individual to the will of Pagan Authority, which the collectivists believe to be "The common good."


And so with fanatic zeal, and a deep-seated conviction that the end justifies the means, they revert to pre-Christian savagery and revive the practice of human sacrifice to purge, or cleanse Society of all persons, classes and races who do not share their views.

**There is some refuge from certain other forms of tyranny. Generally speaking, they are less thoroughly organized and not so remorselessly armed with the self-righteousness of the Humanitarian with the Guillotine.**

*But the misguided benevolence of complete social and economic power always leads to the ruthless suppression of religious freedom, personal freedom, freedom of expression – and even freedom of thought.*

## CHAPTER 6

# The Living Authorities, Etc.



*The Pagan may lose confidence in one particular kind of Authority but he finds it difficult to accept the non-pagan view that human beings are self-controlling. When a pagan's faith begins to waver he is more likely to change the name of the imaginary Authority – or else assume that it controls everyone except himself. Old World minds have rarely doubted that they are controlled by some Authority outside themselves, but down through*

*the ages they have become inclined to the belief that the Authority resides in a human form – either a living god – or some exalted person who by reason of birth, ancestry, class, race or color is endowed with divine or supernatural attributes which make him or her the living embodiment of God.*

The Pharaohs of Egypt, the Roman Emperors, and the Japanese Mikado were believed to be gods in human form. Until 1911 the Empress of China was a sacred being. The Tibetans still believe that God incarnates Himself in their Great Lama. In 1776, continental Europeans, South and Central Americans and most North Americans believed that their Kings were God's appointed agents, ruling by Divine Right. As recently as the first World War most Europeans and all Asiatics took it for granted that anyone of Royal blood was endowed with divine qualities.

In all cases such beliefs rest on the Pagan superstition that the individual is not responsible for his acts – that he must depend on these super-human persons who have both



the right and the power to control the lives of people who are assumed to be their natural inferiors.

Whether the monarch is looked upon as a living god or as God's personal agent, all property is at his disposal and in practice he bestows great wealth and the exercise of some authority on a few persons who form a superior class: nobles, samurai, aristocrats, bureaucratic ministers in control of this, that and the other. Such men, headed by their Emperor, their King or their Queen are looked upon as the Government.

### THEORY *versus* PRACTICE

In theory, the change from ancient communism to an "omnipotent" Living Authority should not make much difference in the lives of the people – but in actual practice it usually brings certain benefits:

Those who rule by "Divine Right" are inclined to accept their inherited authority as a matter of course. Generally speaking, they do not have the ruthless ambitions of the self-made dictator who rises to power in a collectivist society. And again, generally speaking, they are not so remorselessly armed with the mystical self-righteousness of the Humanitarian with the Guillotine.

The superficialities of court life provide an outlet for Royal energy that is less harmful (and far less expensive) than unintelligent meddling.

The Living Monarch does not live forever. He dies and another Monarch takes his place. Such interruptions (in contrast to the communistic state) are usually accompanied by changes in rules and regulations. The static routine is broken. Mystical fanaticism is reduced and individual energy tends to assert itself to some degree.

So whenever and wherever any large number of persons have broken away from the changeless routine of ancient communism, their energies have worked a little, by fits and starts, to improve their living conditions.

FOR INSTANCE: During sixty centuries, human energy (already having the wheel) managed to get a cart onto two wheels and attached knives to them, to kill the subjects of their King's enemy-King. Then, after a lapse that almost lost the wheel, they finally got a cart onto four wheels. But up to the time of George Washington, the efforts of all men to improve transportation had only been able to produce a coach – and only for the *very rich*. Gilded and supported on leather straps above four iron-shod wheels, you may see it today in the carriage house at Mount Vernon.

*Another instance:* Three thousand years ago in Greece, men knew the principle of the steam engine. The Greeks spread their civilization over the known world after the Macedonians conquered it. Yet today on the Tigris and the Euphrates men are still paddling logs hollowed out by fire, or else drifting downstream in bowls of rawhide stretched on saplings. And from Baghdad they walk back upstream a thousand miles, just as American flatboatmen in colonial times used to walk back from New Orleans to Pittsburgh.

*Another:* For forty centuries, men sailed boats. In addition to sails, the Phoenicians used oars. The Romans went a step further, using two or three banks of oars – with slaves chained to each oar. Through overseers using whips, the captain thus had some control of the boat's direction and speed. This questionable advance was lost and Columbus sailed in ships dependent wholly on the winds. But by 1776, the French were again using the Roman galley system, with convicts chained to the oars.

## CAUSE AND EFFECT

The above are only a few examples illustrating that under the living Authorities, human energy *has worked in jerks*, so to speak. Take any few hundred years of Old World history, and we find a succession of convulsive efforts and collapses, as if a living thing were roped down and struggling.

That is precisely what was happening. Human energy could not get to work at its primary, *natural* job of producing and distributing the necessities of human life, because whenever men began to develop farming and crafts and trade, the Government stopped them.

## UNINTENTIONAL

Mind you, the Government never intended to stop them; indeed, the honest aim was to help them. But the effect was the opposite, for the simple reason that efforts to help were based on the false notion that human energy and individual initiative can be directed and controlled through an overriding Authority using the brute force of military and police power.

Force and fear have their uses. We'll come to that in a moment. But they are ineffective in stimulating ambition, initiative, creative effort and perseverance.

Threats of the concentration camp or the firing squad might make a man run a little faster or work a little harder – at least for a time. But fear reduces endurance and hastens fatigue. It also works at cross purposes to mental development and moral growth. It depresses the higher nerve centers and its continued use tends to paralyze the normal processes of thought.

Thus it is that slave labor has never been able to compete with free men in fields that require a high degree of initiative, resourcefulness and persistence.

Furthermore, the unbridled use of arbitrary power, maintained through force and fear, always has a demoralizing and *degenerating effect on those who use it*. It breeds arrogance, intolerance and sadism.

It's like the dope habit. It may start out innocently enough, but it feeds on itself and things go from bad to worse. The more anyone relies on it the greater the temptation to increase the dose. Thus the "temporary" remedy be-

comes a pernicious habit, and it's almost impossible to turn back.

It's true that man has not yet attained a degree of intelligence that makes it possible to do away with the use of force *entirely*.

When one man or a small group of men revert to animal-like violence, decent people have only one choice: *They must use force as a means of neutralizing the MISUSE of force.*

Policemen are needed to deal with the occasional criminals, robbers and killers who hinder the constructive work of the majority. Where there is no police force every man must be ready to defend himself and his property and this takes time away from useful work.

## VIGILANCE COMMITTEE

In the pioneer days of our own wild West, each man carried a gun. The need for force was rare and few of them ever shot anybody. But everyone had to be armed and ready, on the off-chance that he might have to shoot it out with a Bad Man.

Normal men do not like to lug guns around; they want to get on with their natural jobs of clearing land, planting crops, raising cattle, drilling oil wells, building towns. To do their work in security and peace, they had to get rid of the Bad Man. So when emergencies arose they would organize themselves into a vigilance committee, go after the Bad Man, and string him up. They did this clear across the continent, from the Yadkin to the Rio Grande, the Golden Gate and the Columbia.

Although the viligance committee was created by honest citizens as a means of stopping thieves and murderers, it sometimes turned into gangsterism. The right-thinking members were inclined to drop out as soon as the emergency was over because no right-thinking person likes the

idea of killing a fellow man. But the less scrupulous would stay in, and once having broken the bond of human kinship that protects men from violence against each other, some of them became killers at heart.

Thus, it frequently happened that the vigilance committee degenerated into a group of lawless gangsters and the situation was worse than before.\*

## ORDERLY SOLUTION

So it was only natural that peaceful men should organize a legal force to make a regular job of preserving law and order.

They selected a few of their number and said to them, in effect, "You keep the peace. Sheriff, you carry the gun for all of us from now on. You, Judge, call on twelve of us to decide what to do with any Bad Man that the sheriff catches alive. It's your job to preserve law and order so that the rest of us can get our work done without interference. You give your whole time to it and we'll supply you with food, shelter, and other necessities."

That's a good example of government stripped to its bare essentials. It is a justifiable use of force because it increases the general well-being and the productive output of normal citizens by enabling them to use their energies to the best advantage and without interference.

## MORAL *versus* LEGAL

Human energy cannot operate effectively except when men are free, but freedom cannot be separated from responsibility and liberty does not mean license. No one has a right to infringe on the rights of others.

---

\* This same sequence of events had its parallel, on a huge and aggravated scale, in the kinds of things that happened in Europe during the chaotic period between the two World Wars.

Certain restraints are necessary and they are provided in two ways:

1. LEGAL RESTRAINTS – *the passing of laws to be administered by governmental agencies and enforced by police power.*
2. MORAL RESTRAINTS – *which depend on individual self-discipline, logical reasoning, good sportsmanship, and a consideration for the rights of others.*

Legal restraints, as already pointed out, are useful in curbing activities that are clearly injurious and which are generally recognized as being opposed to the best interest of all decent people. But legal restraints are inadequate when we get over into the area of questionable practices which *cannot be sharply defined*; or which are *not easily detected*; or which are *not generally disapproved*.

It's easy to say "*let's settle this or that by passing a law,*" but laws on the statute books can never be an adequate substitute for moral restraint, based on enlightened self-interest – which means a recognition of one's *duties* as well as one's *rights*.

The extension of laws into areas where they can't be enforced does more harm than good:

1. It takes emphasis off of personal responsibility and promotes the dangerous notion that legalized force can be used as a substitute for self-control and individual morality.
2. It increases red tape and government overhead – *without accomplishing the intended result.*
3. It weakens respect for the *really necessary laws.*
4. Law observance breaks down and remedy is sought in bolstering the penalties *and passing additional laws.*
5. Along with it all, the administrative and enforcement facilities are further increased – which

means *taking more and more people off of productive work.*

Any attempt to underwrite to government the things that are the proper responsibilities of the individual citizen, works at cross purposes to the advancement of personal freedom. It retards progress, *morally* as well as along the lines of *greater productivity.*

Look at it from any angle you please and there's no escaping the conclusion that moral restraints are more efficient than legal restraints – which incidentally, is just another way of saying that honesty and decency are *profitable.*

Right here the objection may be raised that “to depend on moral restraints calls for quite a change in human behavior.”

I won't attempt to argue the point except to say that **changes and further improvements in the direction of enlightened self-interest and personal responsibility are not nearly so difficult to attain as the unnatural changes that are advocated by those who would repress individual development and reduce human beings to the status of the beehive.**

Progress lies in the direction of working in harmony with the fundamental nature of man as against reverting to the pagan superstition which, for over 6,000 years, has suppressed individual initiative and kept human energy in a strait jacket.

## REGIMENTATION

In modern times it goes under the persuasive name “Planned-Economy,” which is nothing more than a weasel-word for *Socialism – Communism – Fascism.*

Call it anything you please, but it's still the pagan concept – *based on a misunderstanding of human energy.*

It is an attempt to make a static world in a dynamic and changing universe. It is an attempt to make the gasoline

engine run on steam – or the steam engine run on gasoline. In brief, it is an attempt to do the impossible.

### CONTRAST


It is difficult for Americans to understand the stagnating effects of regimentation and how it leads to greater and greater oppressions. It is outside the range of our experience, because we have lived in a new kind of world where human energy and initiative have worked under the natural control of the individual – which is the only way that they can ever be made to work effectively.

**For 160 years, during the greatest demonstration of progress that the world has ever known, each American has been free to decide for himself how to earn money and whether to save or spend it – whether to go to school or go to work – whether to stick to his job or leave it and get another, or go into business on his own – whether to plant cotton or corn, whether to rent or buy or build a house – how much he would (*or would not*) pay for a shirt or car – and what he would take for the Jersey calf or the old jalopy.**



## CHAPTER 7

# The Static Center



There is simply no escaping the fact that human beings progress and prosper in proportion to the degree to which individual initiative is permitted – *or at least not prevented*. But Old World Government has always been based on the fallacious idea of *Authority controlling a planned economy for the so-called common good*. Actually it is nothing more than the arbitrary use of physical force by persons upon persons – and regardless of the high

motives and good intentions, the effect is the same. *It always slows down progress and hinders the production and distribution of the necessities of life.*

This explains the historic fact, at first surprising, that a sincere, conscientious, hard-working ruler always does the most harm to his own subjects.

The lazy, dissolute ruler neglects his job. Caligula, for instance, merely wasted goods in riotous extravagance and tortured just a few hundred of his subjects for his personal enjoyment. The majority of people always gets along comparatively well under a ruler like Caligula.

It was sober, ascetic, industrious Octavius Augustus Caesar, toiling for the welfare of his Empire and its people, who began the destruction of Rome and laid the foundation for the misery and human degradation which Europeans suffered for centuries thereafter.

He launched a planned economy which was to serve as the basis for the Roman World Peace. The Roman Legions gave it to all the people of the then known world – as fast as they could be conquered.

From Africa and Asia to England that peace extended, and it was designed to last forever.

The hair-splitting economic regulations were perfected by Diocletian whose stern directives were so efficiently administered that farmers could no longer farm and most of the small business men, faced with starvation, committed suicide in preference to execution for black marketing.

There was no work for the working man, so the beneficent Government stepped in, and (by taxing the rich) managed for a while to provide the populace with bread and circus tickets.

But that was no solution. The improvement was short-lived. *Money can't buy goods unless the goods are produced.*

The mounting taxes put more and more people out of business. An increasing number of workers were forced onto tax-supported relief, until there was not enough productive energy at work to pay the tax bills, and the great Roman Empire, with its dreams for a thousand years of peace and security, collapsed into the Dark Ages.

*That was the work of the best of Emperors.*

## BRITISH EMPIRE

At the other extreme let us turn to England which, for many centuries, was blessed with some of the worst rulers that ever wore a crown. If Richard the Lion-Hearted had stayed at home and tended to his job, or if King John had been half as good a ruler as his grandfather, there never could have been a Magna Carta.

The only able Tudor was Queen Elizabeth, whose father Henry VIII had left England so uncontrolled that it took all her energy and wit just to hold onto her throne. There

was no time left for her to rule and never was a realm so loosely governed. She built up the British navy by doing nothing for it. She told her sea captains to act on their own responsibility and at their own cost. She wouldn't even pay for the powder and lead that they used to defend England against the Spanish Armada. Her plan was to *do no planning*. With great firmness of character and consistency of purpose, she always decided to *decide nothing*. By this highly intelligent means, she *let* her subjects found the British Empire.

The good Queen Bess was succeeded by the Stuarts, a charming self-indulgent breed of Divine Right Kings – the poodle dogs of their species – with not a moral under their curly wigs. They governed so negligently that the butchers and bakers and candlestick makers chucked them off the throne and made ex-brewer Cromwell the ruler of England.

Even after such a lesson, the Stuarts later came back to power so lazily that Charles the Second gave his Parliament the order: “I pray you devise any good *short bills* that may improve the industry of the realm.”\*

That was all. And while the King uttered such idle words, his police were so few that it was no longer necessary to bribe them. Thousands of smugglers took over and boomed British foreign trade from every port and cove. They were so numerous that a wit described Merrie England as “*a piece of land entirely surrounded by smugglers!*”

## WOOLEN SHROUDS

At that time Continental weavers depended on England for raw wool which they wove into cloth far superior to the product of English looms. To protect the domestic manufacturers, Parliament prohibited any further export of English wool.

Of course, this measure would have ruined the English

---

\* Parliamentary History, Vol. 4.

woolgrowers, but *as always in all history*, realistic tradesmen rescued commerce.

And when the prospering English woolgrowers expanded production so rapidly that the black marketeers could no longer handle all the export trade, Charles offered only one little remedy for "over-production." *He decreed that no corpse could be buried in England that was not wrapped in a woolen shroud of domestic manufacture.*

The measure was strictly enforced, the wool was buried, but ghouls dug up the corpses, stole the shrouds which, through bootlegging, finally covered the naked legs of London's workingmen.

#### GERMANY AND FRANCE

The Continental rulers with their powerful police forces were more efficient – especially in the Germanies where everything was so thoroughly regulated that production and commerce almost ceased to exist.

And here is Buckle's comment, with particular reference to France:

"In every quarter and at every moment, the hand of Government was felt. Duties on importation, and on exportation; bounties to raise up a losing trade, and taxes to pull down a remunerative one; this branch of industry forbidden, and that branch of industry encouraged; one article must not be grown because it was grown in the colonies, another article might be grown and bought, but not sold again, while a third article might be bought and sold, but not leave the country.

"Then, too," continues Buckle, "we find laws to regulate wages, laws to regulate prices, laws to regulate the interests on money; custom-house arrangements of the most vexatious kind, aided by a complicated sliding scale of such perverse ingenuity that duties varied on the same article, and no man could calculate beforehand what he would have to pay.

“The tolls were so onerous as often to double and quadruple the cost of every article.

“A large part of all this was by way of protection. The money was raised, and the inconveniences suffered, *not for the use of Government*, but for the *benefit of the people*. In other words, the industrious were robbed, in order that industry might thrive. All the most important interests have been grievously damaged by the attempts of legislatures to aid them . . . by an interminable series of regulations, all intended for [industry’s] good, and all inflicting serious harm.

“The first inevitable consequence was that in every part of Europe there arose numerous and powerful bands of smugglers, who lived by disobeying the laws. These men, desperate from fear of punishment, spread drunkenness, theft and dissoluteness, coarse and swinish debaucheries, which were the natural habits of so vagrant and lawless a life.”\*

Indeed nothing but smuggling kept the French from starving to death under the care of their State, benevolently planned for their welfare.

During the reign of Louis XIV the French weavers went through a whole season without moving a shuttle. While the people were waiting for clothes, the weavers were waiting for the Government to tell them what kind of cloth they would be allowed to weave, what color it should be, and how many threads would be permitted for each inch of warp and woof.

The regulations on the textile industry alone covered over 3,000 pages – and they were different for each district. The manufacturers of Saint-Maixent, for example, had to negotiate for four years before the government allowed them to use black warp – and they never did get permission to use black woof.

---

\* Slightly condensed from Vol. 1, *History of Civilization in England*, by Henry Thomas Buckle (1857).

Human energy simply does not work the way the Despots and Dictators would like to have it work. It works only under its natural control. Any attempt to make it work through the use of police force has always failed and civilization has been held back.

### WEAK ALIBI

It is contended by some that the people of the Old World are more interested in the higher things of life – that they have never had any desire for what is scornfully called the “material civilization” of the Western World.

Perhaps; and perhaps slaves carrying loads on their backs were not permitted to invent a four wheeled wagon. It’s hard to say. But surely, human beings – *all human beings* – have always wanted food. Yet for six thousand years they have been hungry and dying of hunger. And under such conditions there is not much chance for widespread improvement along cultural and moral lines. (This will be dealt with more fully in a later chapter.)

### DOWN THROUGH THE AGES

Egyptians erected their stately pyramids, and sold their daughters to brothels because they could not feed them. Athenians built their proud Parthenon and went to their democratic elections amidst desolate wails from pottery jars along their streets, where babies were dying. A mother’s friends would put her baby into a jar to die slowly, in the forlorn hope that it might be rescued by someone who could afford to feed a child.

In Asia and Africa, famines have never ceased. In Europe, the working people have never yet obtained enough milk, butter, fruits. Over the greater part of this earth, women as well as men continue to give sixteen hours of literally killing labor for the day’s meager food. In peaceful Shanghai’s most prosperous days, every morning at dawn

the policemen gathered up from the streets the bodies of men, women, children who *had died of hunger during the night. It was a routine job.*

But so much for progress during the past six thousand years. And why consider such a short period?

As far back as two hundred and fifty thousand years ago, people lived in caves in France and Spain. People still live in caves in France and Spain. The cliffs of Chinchilla are still inhabited, now; at Coria the pottery workers live as they have always lived in holes along the banks of the Guadalquivir, without floors or windows. In Italy, in Greece, in Yugoslavia, in Russia, many people still live underground.

#### ANCESTRAL HABITAT

“Shortly after the first World War,” writes Mrs. Lane, “I was in the Balkans when American Red Cross workers found families living in a clay bank in Montenegro’s largest city. We were horrified and I wrote a piece about those homeless victims of war that would have wrung dollars from the stoniest American pocketbook. But I did not mail it. I went back with an interpreter to give some first aid to those miserable refugees. My sympathetic questions bewildered them. I discovered that they were living as they always had lived, in their ancestral homes.”

If men and women do not want to live like that, if they do not want to be always in destitution – always on the verge of starvation – then they must come to realize that they and *they alone* can control their human energies.

The State is *called* the *government*, but because of the nature of human energy, it cannot actually govern the individual acts of any person. Men in public office are only men, and no man can control another’s thoughts, speech, or actions. No possible use of physical force can compel anyone to think, speak, or act. It can only limit, hinder and prevent.

In the last analysis, and stripped of all the furbelows, *Government is nothing more than a legal monopoly of the use of physical force – by persons upon persons.*

And the monopoly is permitted by common consent. No government can exist without the consent and economic support of the people.

This important fact is quite obvious when you consider the frontier sheriff who was elected to protect the good men against the Bad Man. It is somewhat less obvious in the case of the Old World tyrants and dictators, but the fact remains that their power rests on the consent and support of the people. The best evidence of this is that the pages of history are full of rebellions against earthly rulers.

#### REVOLTS *versus* REVOLUTIONS

All men who have ever obeyed a living Authority have in time revolted against it. Look at the history of Assyria, Persia, Egypt, Rome, Spain, France, England; look at any records of any people living anywhere at any time in the Old World's history. Sooner or later they revolt.

But with minor exceptions, such revolts have been directed against *a particular Authority*, without disturbing the Pagan belief that *some Authority* should control their lives and be responsible for their welfare.

When such people don't get enough to eat, they merely conclude that the existing Authority doesn't control them *properly* – that everything would be all right if they were governed by a *new Authority*, or a *stronger and wiser Authority* – one who could really make good on the age-old and alluring promise of something for nothing.

SO THEY REBEL against their King and set up another King. At a later date they rebel against him and set up still another. Then as time goes on they rebel against monarchy itself and set up some other kind of Authority.



Every imaginable kind of Living Authority has been tried, also every possible combination such as: the priest and the king, the king who is the priest, the king who is God, the king and a senate, the king and the senate and a majority, the senate and a tyrant, the tyrant and the aristocrats.

*Think of any combination that comes to mind; somewhere it has been tried and most of them somewhere on this earth are being tried right today.*

**D**OWN THROUGH THE AGES, century after century, time and time again, men have killed their rulers and slaughtered each other in untold millions, in the effort to find an Authority that would better their conditions.

Such rebellions sometimes bring temporary benefits. They interrupt the mechanism of attempted control and permit human energy to work a little – for a little while.

But the Old World revolutions are not REAL revolutions. They are revolutions only in the sense of a *wheel rotating around a motionless center*. Under the Pagan view, the standard pattern has always been to overthrow one form of Authority merely to replace it with another form of Authority – from priest to king; from king to oligarchy; from oligarchy to despot; from despot to majority; from majority to bureaucracy; from bureaucracy to dictator . . . from dictator to king . . . from king to . . . etc., . . . there's been six thousand years of it in every language and for six thousand years people have gone hungry – for the very simple reason that human energy cannot be made to work efficiently except in an atmosphere of individual freedom and voluntary cooperation – based on enlightened self-interest and moral responsibility.



**There has never been but one REAL revolution.**

**It is the revolution *against* Pagan Fatalism**

**– the revolution for Human Freedom.**


PART THREE

**The Revolution**

*Son of Tarah*

## CHAPTER 8

# The First Attempt



*No one knows who first made the discovery that men are free. The fragmentary records begin with one person.*

There is no historical proof that he ever really existed but the story holds its own self-evident truth – and for countless generations it was handed down by father to son.

They said that when Ur was the great empire (about 4,000 years ago) a shepherd named Tarah accompanied by his son, his daughter-in-law and an orphaned nephew, traveled with his flocks

toward the far west.

When Tarah died, his son Abraham continued westward, with his cousins and their families. They also were shepherds, always moving with their flocks.

This was back in the days when people believed that everything was controlled by the whims and the fancies of pagan gods. Water-gods, when they felt so disposed, made water flow; sea-gods moved the waves and tides; air-gods controlled the winds; gods whispered in trees, roared in thunder, and brought rain to the fields. Fertility-gods caused seeds to sprout, and women to bear children. Gods controlled men just as they controlled all other things.

*As water ran and winds blew, so men thought and felt and acted as the gods might will.*

But Abraham denied the existence of all these pagan gods. He insisted that there is only one God, the God of all things – the God who creates and judges. He taught his increasing family that God is Rightness: Reality and Truth – that man is free and self-controlling and responsible for his own acts – that each person is free to do good or evil, as he may choose, but that any wrong act will result in punishment to the evildoer.

Incidentally, I cannot see that it is any sacrilege to observe in passing that Abraham's theological concept laid the foundation for scientific progress. So long as men labored under the delusion that the universe was controlled by the whims and fancies of prankish gods, there was no point in trying to improve anything through individual effort.

Progress did not come until men began to realize that everything works according to a Divine Plan – the essence of which is Truth and Rightness.

As will be discussed in a later chapter, this applies not only to questions of morality but to all other things. Every engineer, every scientist, every farmer and every mechanic knows that nothing will work – no act will succeed unless it is in harmony with Rightness – *the true nature of things as they are.*

## JOSEPH

When Abraham died, very old, his sons buried him in the land that is now Turkey.

The record says that many years later, during one of the famines, the descendants of Abraham moved into Egypt in search of food. There, as time went on, they became a rich and privileged class. It seems that they had a pull with a kinsman named Joseph, who understood the crop cycle, and made himself Pharaoh's favorite by laying out a planned economy known as the ever-normal granary.

But when the crops failed and the famine came, the farmers and herdsmen had to sign away their fields and pastures in order to get back enough grain to keep them from starving. Thus the rank and file Egyptians were reduced to virtual slavery, but the privileged classes, rich and secure, had no particular objection to slavery. It didn't hurt them – *or at least that's what they thought.*

Abraham's descendants, along with the favored classes, grew and prospered and “multiplied exceedingly” – *for a while.* Then the old, old, endless repetition occurred once more.

A new man came into power. He was anxious to gain favor with the Egyptians and he said unto them: “The children of Israel are more and mightier than we; come on, let us deal justly with them!”

The oppressed classes rallied to his call. They seized the Israelites' property and set about to liquidate them. They placed them in bondage, worked many of them to death and killed the Israelite babies.

## MOSES

Finally a man named Moses came to the rescue. With great difficulty he got the children of Israel out of Egypt and across the Red Sea. Some of them died on the journey, and those who came through alive were not very appreciative. After long years of slavery they had forgotten the teachings of Abraham and expected others to take care of all their needs. They would do nothing for themselves and soon they turned against Moses and blamed him for all their troubles. When food was scarce they howled that he was starving them. And when he didn't bring them water they wailed that he was killing them with thirst.

You wonder how Moses stuck it out, but for 40 years he kept on telling them that they were free men – that they were responsible for themselves. “Ye are not murmuring

against me," he told them, "but against the God of Abraham."

*But slaves are passive. They submit. They obey. And they expect to be fed.*

They wanted Moses to be their king so they could hold him responsible and blame him for everything, but Moses turned them down and kept on insisting that they were free, responsible for themselves; that there was no pagan god to control them and be responsible for them, and that no man could rule another man.

But the children of Israel kept on murmuring, drifting back into idolatry and sneaking every chance to worship their pagan gods.

Finally Moses, as a last resort, reduced the teachings of Abraham to a written code of moral laws. They are known as the Ten Commandments and they stand today as the first and greatest document of individual freedom in the known history of man.

Each of the Ten Commandments is addressed to the individual, as a self-controlling person responsible for his own thoughts, words and acts. And each of them recognizes liberty and freedom as inherent in the nature of man.

The **FIRST** commandment tells the individual to reject pagan gods and recognize his own worth as a human being, subject to no power but that of the Creator and Judge.

The **SECOND** tells the individual to form no image of abstract Rightness but to direct his reverence toward the Divine in Truth.

The **THIRD** tells the individual not to speak frivolously of the Creator and Judge. Knowledge of fundamental truth – cause and effect – is of first importance and should be taken *very* seriously.



The FOURTH tells the individual to devote some time (one day out of seven) to reflection on the eternal verities.

The FIFTH recognizes the family as the primary human relationship, and establishes the parent's authority over the child as the only authority which a child should accept for *his own* profit.

The SIXTH stresses the sanctity of human life, the individual's right to live, a right that must not be violated by any other person.

The SEVENTH establishes the principle of contract, the inviolability of promises given by persons to each other and the double sanctity of the marriage contract which is the basis of the family.

The EIGHTH recognizes the individual's right of ownership of property.

The NINTH recognizes free speech: the individual's control over his own utterances and his responsibility for their truth.

The TENTH emphasizes again the right of ownership. Not even in thought should a person violate the property rights of another.

The decalogue of Moses is one of the most amazing statements of truth that has ever been written – but it was too revolutionary to find acceptance in the pagan world of the time and the ancient Israelites wanted a king rather than a code of personal conduct.

## GIDEON

As time went on they put their proposition up to Gideon. After he had freed them from the Midianites the men of Israel said to Gideon, "Rule thou over us, both thou and thy son and thy son's son, for thou hast delivered us from the hand of Midian."

Anyone who believes that government has real power will

accept such an offer ; either because he selfishly wants power or because in imagined unselfishness he wants to force others into doing what he believes will be good for them.

But Gideon replied, "*I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you. The Lord shall rule over you.*"

Still the Israelites were not satisfied. They kept on trying to escape from freedom and the responsibility that *IS* freedom.

## SAMUEL

A hundred years later their grandsons were still seeking a king. They begged the wise man Samuel to make them a king but Samuel agreed with his predecessors and pointed out in no uncertain terms the fallacy of their reasoning :

"This," said Samuel, "shall be the manner of the king that shall reign over you ; he will take your sons and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint his captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground and to reap his harvest, and to make his weapons of war. And he will take your fields, and your olive yards, even the best of them, and he will take the tenth of your seed and of your vineyards, and he will take the tenth of your men servants and your maid servants, and your goodliest young men, and put them to his work. And ye shall cry out in that day, because of this king which *ye shall have chosen.*"

Here is a precise statement of the sources of the State's power, and of the results of a State's attempt to control its subjects in either ancient or modern times : first, the taking away of productive energy, then the rise of bureaucracy and heavy taxation, followed by stagnation and poverty, leading to ultimate destruction in war.

The wise man Samuel stated it better than I can, but the Israelites were still not convinced and they answered : "Nay,

but we will have a king over us, that we may be *like all the nations*, and that our king may *go before us and fight our battles.*"

## HISTORY REPEATS

And in the end the Israelites had their way. They went back to pagan submission to an imaginary Authority. They got themselves a king – in fact a whole series of kings, including Solomon who lived in great splendor, in a fabulous palace – surrounded by magnificent public buildings paid for by ever-increasing taxes.

At long last, the Israelites were like other nations and like other nations they were defeated in war. Their great city was destroyed and their conquerors used the then-ancient method of mass-deportation – the same method that has been revived and vastly extended in recent times.

Only a few Israelites were left in all Judea and under Roman tyranny they slavishly obeyed their overlords.

## RICH HERITAGE

But the teaching of the ancient prophets, Abraham, Moses, Gideon and Samuel had not been in vain – and it is one of the greatest achievements of history that the straggling little tribes of Israelites should have preserved the teachings of their ancient prophets and passed them down through countless generations.

Most of the Old World rulers have always hated the Jew, because for 4,000 years the word Jew has stood for freedom and individual initiative as against the pagan concept of a static world and submission to the gods of superstition.

**B**UT THE KNOWLEDGE that men are free is not enough. If the human race is to progress, then individual freedom must be combined and tempered with the principles of cooperation based on a recognition of human brotherhood.

The ancient Israelites lived most of the time without any government whatever – which was not without its advantage because it permitted them to apply their full energies to the raising of crops, caring for their flocks and making their simple clothes and shelter.

But unrestrained anarchy cannot produce a well-rounded civilization. The development of production beyond the handicrafts and the building of extensive commerce, require organization. Effective organization depends on cooperation and cooperation rests on a knowledge and acceptance of human brotherhood.

## THE NEW COMMANDMENT

Christ came upon the earth 2,000 years after the time of Abraham. He reiterated and crystallized the teachings of the Hebrew Prophets. He spoke of the God of Abraham. The God of Truth. The God of Rightness. The God that does not control any man but Who judges the acts of every man.

Christ illustrated His teachings through practical examples, simple parables and stories expressed in terms of personal relations between individuals.

And most important of all He brought a new commandment – the foundation of intelligent self-interest and practical cooperation: Love thy neighbor as thyself. Do to others as you would be done by. For whatsoever ye do unto the least of human beings ye do it unto Me. (You do it to all persons including yourself.)

Although gentle and kindly, Christ was a fighter who brought a sword of truth that would destroy the Pagan Kingdoms.

He rendered unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's but only the things that force could take – a coin, a material thing – even life itself – but never a surrender of freedom. He attacked the priests. He scorned their assumption of

Authority and openly defied them. In sermons and parables and acts, Christ always asserted individual freedom. The kingdom of God is *within you*. Our Father in Heaven, Thy Kingdom come on earth, for Thine *is* the Kingdom. The meek shall inherit the earth.

Although He was followed by multitudes there were few who understood the full import of His teachings. Most of them believed that they had found a leader who would set up the kind of kingdom that they had urged upon Moses, Gideon and Samuel.

**The times were ripe for a revolt against Rome.  
According to the record, Christ could have had  
the kingdoms of the world.**

*Christ Refused.*

## CHAPTER 9

# Compromise



Abraham declared that man is a free agent – *responsible only to God.*

Moses reduced the teachings of Abraham to a written code of moral law – *directed to the individual.* Christ expanded on these teachings and added a new commandment *emphasizing the principle of human brotherhood.*

These events marked the turning point in a world that had long been dominated by the gods of superstition – the *Will-of-the-Swarm and the Living Authorities.*

In relation to recorded history Abraham, Moses and Christ lived in ancient times, but the pagan view, to which they were opposed, dates back to the beginning of primitive man which has been estimated at 500,000 years ago. So, relatively speaking, the foundations of the Hebrew-Christian religion are of modern origin.

The new teachings were too revolutionary to be accepted all at once, and even down to this day they have never been given a thorough trial. But the impact on the deep-seated superstitions was terrific – and history, since the time of Christ, is largely a record of the conflicts and compromises between paganism and freedom.

There had been glimmerings of freedom, perhaps independently of Abraham and the Hebrew prophets, but nowhere else do we find the principles so clearly stated and emphasized as a God-given right of the *individual person.*

## GREECE

In ancient Greece, for example, there had been some degree of freedom but it was on a class basis and even in the days of their highest culture the Greeks continued to cherish their pagan gods.

They believed, for example, that a man loved a woman because a god had shot an arrow into his heart. The chubby little figure on our valentines of today was as real to the Greeks as electricity is to present-day Americans.

The Greeks had implicit faith in the ability of the government to take care of their needs. It never seems to have occurred to them that the individual person is self-controlling, and responsible for his own acts.

They labored under the delusion that their democracy was a guarantee of peace and plenty, not realizing that unrestrained majority rule always destroys freedom — puts the minority at the mercy of the mob, and works at cross-purposes to the effective use of human energy and individual initiative.\*

Paradoxically, the democratic process, when not kept within bounds, has always led to the destruction of the democratic ideals, serving as a springboard to dictatorship and war.

The temptation to buy votes through government spending is too great. Prompted by political ambitions or a sincere desire to do good — and *usually both* — a champion of the people emerges with appealing promises of the greatest

---

\* It seems unfortunate that so many Americans should have lost sight of the fact that our government was designed—NOT as a *democracy*, but as a *REPUBLIC*. It's interesting to note that the word Democracy does not appear in the Declaration of Independence, nor in the Constitution, nor in the Bill of Rights, and I've been told that prior to 1913 it had never been used in any official presidential statement. Belief in the democratic process as a defense of liberty and freedom may be just as ineffective as was the faith of the French in their Maginot Line. (See Chapter 15).

good to the greatest number – to be financed through government spending.

Supply and demand are thrown out of gear. The overhead goes up, the effective use of human energy goes down and the standard of living is lowered *because money cannot buy wealth that is not produced.*

It is like a habit-forming drug: Temporary relief is sought by increasing the dose but no government can support its people for the simple reason that *a government must derive its support from the people.*

In Greece it was the glittering Pericles who, in the role of benefactor, set up and maintained his dictatorship through increased government spending. Then to divert attention from the impending disaster, he led his followers into the even greater disaster of war against Sparta.

It was the beginning of the end for Greece.

But there had been some degree of freedom among the upper classes and it reflected itself in their contributions to architecture, art, science and philosophy.

## ROMANS

Taking advantage of what could be learned from the Greek philosophers, the methodical Romans built a political structure based on codified law.

Written codes of law had been in existence prior to the Romans and even before the time of Moses, but in the main they had been nothing more than expressions of savage superstition. Instead of being based on equity and justice they were based on cruelty and revenge – *“an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.”*

In ancient Babylon, for example, if your child was killed by a falling roof-stone, the builder of the house would suffer the penalty of having his own child killed in similar manner.



But the Romans, in developing their laws, got away from tribal custom and substituted logic in the place of whim and fancy.

This was an important contribution. Without written law no one knows where he stands but, if the law is to be effective over wide areas, it must be based on something more substantial than local superstition.

The far-flung Roman Empire, including people of vastly different customs and backgrounds, would hardly have been possible except for the clean-cut and reasonably just code of law under which everyone knew where he stood.

By way of illustration, look what would happen in the field of sports – baseball, football, hockey, etc. – if everything were left to the whim and fancy of each umpire and referee. Imagine the confusion that would result if there were no definite and logical “rules of the game” – laid down in advance, agreed to by both sides, and equitably enforced.

The Romans had their “rules of the game” and, generally speaking, these rules were enforced to the letter of the law – impersonally and without prejudice for or against. But there were different laws for different classes of people so it could hardly be said that the rules were agreed to by both sides.

Each person in each class knew where he stood in relation to the law and in theory the privileged class had some say-so as to the fairness of the law but dictatorships were frequent, and the interpretation of the law could be changed to meet the needs of the endless emergencies – both real and fancied.

Thus, the principles of freedom were compromised with the pagan idea of Authoritarian Control. The Romans were never able to solve the problem of true constitutional government but their partial recognition of human rights *under law* brought the problem out in the open and was not without value in leading to its solution some 1400 years

later. Or to say the least, the experiences of the Greeks and the Romans showed *how NOT to do it*.

*As will be seen later, the political structure of the United States is radically different from that of the Greeks and Romans. It is based on the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Christ. Try to rewrite the Declaration of Independence without reference to the Christian axioms and you'll find it can't be done!*

## MANICHAEANS

While the Roman Empire was collapsing under its planned economy, the Christian Church emerged from the chaos as the only coherent group and under its protection individual freedom and initiative were encouraged within limits – especially in the non-controversial areas of art and scientific abstraction.

But the viewpoint persisted that God's Kingdom should assume the form of an earthly monarchy and there were various conflicts and compromises between The Church and the Living Authorities.

Persons act in accordance with their beliefs. So far as the laws of physics permit, they create a human world in the image of their God or Gods. Medieval Europeans held the pagan belief that Authority controls a static universe, including all men.

During the early Christian centuries, the majority of Europeans were followers of Mani, a reformer of the ancient Sun-worship, who had swept Europe with a wave of religious enthusiasm.

They were known as *Manichaeans* and they looked upon the universe, not as a unit, but as a vast battleground torn between conflicting forces. They saw everything in terms of opposites. There was war between light and dark, between good and evil, between soul and body, heat and cold,

wet and dry, up and down. War was the natural order of things. It was everywhere and between all things, including men.

As time went on most of the Manichaeans turned to Christianity but without giving up their pagan views. They continued to believe that Authority controlled them. They continued to think in terms of opposites. They had no difficulty in accepting the two conflicting views that man is *free* and that man is *not free* – that on the one hand the individual person is *self-controlling* and on the other hand he is *controlled by great powers outside himself*.

Thus, when the Manichaean became a Christian he believed with no surprise that his soul belonged to God (or, if he were not careful, to the Devil) and that his body belonged to his master. Just where he himself came into the picture isn't quite clear. But the fact remains that during ages of misery and human degradation The Church kept alive the principles of common decency, morality, humanness, the recognition of human rights and the brotherhood of man.

## FEUDAL SYSTEM

The advance of Christianity in Europe resulted in the rise of the feudal system under which people lived in an invisible world, where space and time were not real but where all souls were equal.

Outside The Church, the system was one that men could not endure unless they wholly believed that the universe is static. They could never have borne its stagnating effects if they had ever imagined progress. But they truly felt that the material world is a temporary waiting-room which needn't be comfortable because one passes through it only on a journey, and any hardships or inequalities will bring future compensations.

In a sense, the feudal system resembles communism, except that it was set up on a *stratified basis*. In theory, each

class contributed according to its ability and received according to its needs – which in practice were gauged by the social position of the particular group. Obviously, since the knight's lady needed horses to ride, it was only fair and proper that the serf should yoke his wife to the plow.

## SECURITY

The absence of responsibility, and freedom from the urge of ambition, were not without their compensations. Discontent was reduced and each class had some degree of economic security.

Fastened to the land, a serf could neither leave it nor lose it. He worked it as he was told; he had a fixed share of any crop that God might will. He could not risk nor lose nor gain anything. If another baron seized the land, the serf, as a part of the booty, stayed right on.

Every man had a fixed place in the structure. As a part of his class, he owed a certain duty to each other class and received from each a certain return.

Barons owed training and leadership to knights. Knights owed military service to their barons. Serfs and peasants worked the land and produced all the necessities of life for the upper classes, from whom they, in turn, received protection and justice.

War was the rule rather than the exception and it raged across the feudal countryside throughout the Dark Ages. But the fighting of wars was on a highly professional basis. It was the sole and exclusive business of knights and barons, and they attended strictly to it, taking only a little time out on Saturday afternoons for a few innocent rounds of highway robbery.

Hunger and famine were also normal and frequently God's wrath (they thought) descended in frightful epidemics of cholera, typhus, bubonic plague, and while lords and ladies fled to house parties on the beautiful countryside,

the lower classes died so swiftly that survivors couldn't bury the corpses.

### PROGRESS (?)

But the specialization of effort and the systematizing of war made it possible for human energy to work with some degree of effectiveness. Famines became less frequent and some of the peasants got so prosperous that they even wore shoes on holidays, when merry crowds thronged to watch men and women burned alive at the stake, broken on the wheel, or hanged, drawn, and quartered.

Craftsmen and artists built the beautiful Gothic cathedrals, and nobody minded living huddled around them with less sanitation than cattle in pens.

But in spite of its drawbacks, the feudal system was one of the most highly perfected forms of social-economic organizations in history. It even had a sort of safety valve to release any undue pressure of energy. A highly gifted boy, even of the lowest class, might hope to get his master's permission to learn to read and write, and enter The Church. The discipline was strict but all men were equal in The Church. Any priest might become a Pope and the son of a peasant actually did become a Pope.

### PAGAN REVERSION

It was under the feudal system that Europe lifted itself out of the Dark Ages and it is held by some that it produced the greatest height of Old World civilization.

But in continental Europe only three or four short-lived generations enjoyed the benefits of its perfection. After that they lived in a period of confusion which the text books describe as the "rise of Nationalism."

Some of the barons managed to steal a march on other barons and make themselves kings, and the other barons didn't quite relish the idea of taking orders from a former fellow-baron.

The skirmishes on the countryside were supplanted by major wars between ambitious nations and the peasants were called from their plows to follow the banners of nationalism.

Even in Catholic countries, Europeans began to accept the theory that the king partook of the divinity of God and that the child of a king was the natural heir to his divine endowment.

This compromise was a backward step and in Europe it wrecked the feudal system which depended on maintaining a communal balance between classes. The reversion to the pagan belief upset the balance, resulting in nationalism and war.

## MAGNA CARTA

Only in Britain was the feudal system kept intact – properly balanced and further improved. On their sea-guarded island, the British barons successfully resisted their kings. At Runnymede, in the year 1215, their armed forces so frightened King John that he signed an agreement to respect feudal customs.

The Magna Carta is an admission from the king that his power is not unlimited. It is a written statement of British liberties which has preserved the best values of the feudal system and served as the foundation for building the British Empire.

But a *grant* of freedom is a denial of the fact that the individual is *naturally* free. A thing that can be given to one person by another person can also be taken away.\*

The big point is that *freedom exists in nature*; it is the individual person's inherent, inalienable self-control, a natural function of the human being, the same as life itself.

---

\* In France, Hungary and Spain the kings also signed Magna Cartas but they were repudiated by later kings.

Man is endowed with liberty by the Creator, just as he is endowed with life and with the power of reason.

To speak of liberty as a grant of permission – by one person to another person – or by a so-called government to its so-called subjects – is within itself a denial of the principle of individual freedom. It is based on the assumption that human beings are incapable of taking care of themselves, and must be held subservient to an Authority that controls their actions and is responsible for their welfare.

The English modified this pagan belief as far as it could be modified under the feudal system, and while other governments used military might to enlarge the area for the use of force, the British merely *permitted* its traders to trade.

In a world of war-made Empires, the British (with the exception of a few lapses into arbitrary planning, and stupid interference with the early American colonies) have used force primarily as a protection to the essential functions of industry and commerce.

Continental Europeans, whose ancestors abandoned the human values of feudalism, are inclined to sneer at the English as a nation of shopkeepers and hypocrites. But only the English have stood for the true values of feudalism, granting to each individual the human rights within his class.

In contrast to ancient Rome, British Authority is tempered with a quality of humaneness. British laws (based on the Ten Commandments) are designed to protect the individual and are administered with a fine sense of equity and a consideration of human rights.

The solitary colonial administrator – full of fever and quinine, who doggedly does his duty in topee and mosquito-boots, and looks after the savages under his care – claims no more for himself than his own human rights *in his own class*.

He does not regard the savage as his social equal any more than he considers himself the social equal of an Earl. In the sight of God and British justice, all men are equal — and in this world, each man has his place.

Although founded on inconsistencies, British feudalism tempered with British sportsmanship and sense of fair play, has made a greater contribution to progress than can ever be expected from any trend toward Marxism.

But so much for the compromises which are presented as a background for the Second and Third Attempts.

*While Europe was still stagnating in the Dark Ages and several centuries before Britain had its Magna Carta, a dynamic but little known civilization, based on a recognition of personal freedom, was blazing in the Near East and spreading along the shores of the Mediterranean.*



## Second Attempt

### *The Saracens*



became widely known and respected.

He traveled, buying and selling goods throughout the greater part of the then civilized world.

Babylon was long forgotten, and the Roman empire had ceased to exist. Europe, sunk in the barbarism of the Dark Ages, was less important than Africa is today. Constantinople had become the center of world trade and around it were the thriving cities, Baghdad, Damascus, Antioch, Alexandria.

**T**O UNDERSTAND THIS MAN, think of a seasoned business executive of today – a man who earns, say \$25,000 a year; a sufficient but not spectacular success.

Shrewd, humorous and friendly – he is more interested in human relations than in problems of trade. He marries his employer, a woman of business ability. Comfortably well off at middle age, they retire, to live, let's say, in Miami, Florida.

He and his wife keep open house. They serve coffee to their friends. The entertainment is conversation. The host's opinions are so unusual that for some three years he is rather reserved in stating his views for fear they may sound too radical. But little by little, he begins to express himself more openly, and friendly arguments originating in his living room begin to spread over the town.

He agrees with Abraham and Christ. The pagan gods do not exist. There is only one God. He is the God of Truth and Rightness. He judges men but does not control them. Each individual is self-controlling and responsible for his acts and all men are brothers.

The man's name was Mohammed and his ideas created terrific excitement, because he was expressing them in Mecca and Mecca was the shrine of the most renowned pagan gods.

From far and wide, pilgrims came to Mecca to worship a strange, heavy black stone which was known to have descended from the heavens. Lesser gods surrounded it and the most famous poets of the day displayed their rhymes in the holy Ka'ba that sheltered the sacred stone.

Mecca made its living off of pilgrims, just as Miami is supported by its tourists. So Mohammed's blasphemy not only shocked the more devout Meccans but the merchants and tradesmen had grave misgivings as to its effect on business.

But Mohammed went right on saying what he thought and he pointed out that Abraham, Moses and Christ had stated these same truths.

He was convinced that the priests had corrupted Abraham's teachings when they assumed authority over the Jews. Christ had attacked the priests and re-asserted the truth. Now the priests were corrupting the teachings of Christ by assuming a controlling authority over the Christians. Mohammed concluded that formal organization

brings the danger of corruption. Each person should be responsible directly to himself for his thoughts, speech, and acts; God would do the judging.

The Pagan priests pronounced their most blasting curses against Mohammed but they were of no avail. The plain people thronged to Mohammed's home in increasing numbers. The more respectable Meccans were increasingly alarmed, but Mecca was a sanctuary in which no blood might be shed. The subversive elements could not be killed. All that could be done was to harass them in the hope that they might leave. Many of Mohammed's followers did leave, but it had an effect *opposite* to what had been hoped. Those who left, spread Mohammed's ideas to other places and many visitors to Mecca spent their time listening to Mohammed instead of at the shrine of Ka'ba.

Then, in spite of the ban against bloodshed in the holy sanctuary, Mecca's more respectable citizens (and tradesmen) took the law in their own hands. They organized themselves into a vigilance committee and stormed Mohammed's home with drawn knives and sabres.

But Mohammed was no longer there. Together with his family and companions — without haste or confusion — he had made tracks for the South. Hot on the trail, the Meccans pursued him but Mohammed (this time without leaving any tracks) had swung leisurely northward. He was headed for Medina, a small town in the palm groves, where people lived mostly on the date harvest and flocks of goats and sheep. It seems that for some time past he had had a standing offer to come there and be its Emir.

Medina was situated on an important road to Mecca. Increasing numbers of pilgrims stopped off to hear Mohammed who converted them to the belief that there is but one God and that the Meccans were idolaters.

This had serious economic repercussions. Mecca's income was cut at its roots and the holy city crashed into its worst

depression. Its people concluded that they could not live in the same world with Mohammed's ideology. Failing to realize that killing Mohammed would not kill his ideas, they prepared for war, and set out to destroy Medina.

With archers, spearsmen and cavalry far outnumbering the total population of Medina, they quietly approached its outskirts before dawn.

There was no sign of resistance. The little town lay quiet and sleeping – unaware of the impending danger.

The Meccan cavalry deployed and, suddenly howling the war-cry, they charged head-on.

Then out of nowhere, their onslaught was met with a terrific barrage of arrows bringing down horses and riders in mid-charge. The attacking cavalry dissolved in a welter of fallen, dying and dead. The survivors pulled out of it in confusion and took another look. But Medina still lay quietly sleeping – with not a defender in sight. This was a miracle. Nothing like it had ever happened before.

**M**OHAMMED had invented a new type of warfare. His men were hidden in trenches completely surrounding the town. To charge into a trench was suicide. To leap it was to be surrounded. Volleys of arrows were futile – most of them sped only to earth.

The Meccans withdrew and tried to figure things out. Then, after a long period of consultation, they galloped furiously back and forth before the trenches, but beyond arrow-range, yelling threats and insults, daring the Medinans to come out and fight like men. Nobody did.

This went on for days. Medina had ample provisions and water. The Meccans consumed theirs.

Finally, at their wits end, unable to think of anything else to do, they turned back toward Mecca, two hundred miles away.

News of their unfought war probably reached there ahead of them. Certainly it traveled with the caravans as fast as camels could go. It is the kind of news that no one forgets to tell. Soon it had spread to all the bazaars of India, China, Persia, Arabia, Byzantium, Palestine, all northern Africa and to every oasis in the Sahara.

**A**FTER SIX YEARS IN MEDINA, Mohammed traveled back to Mecca as a peaceful pilgrim (but prudently accompanied by thirty thousand good fighting men, amply armed).

A deputation met him outside the city to welcome him to the holy sanctuary, in which no blood could be shed. The Meccans accepted his religion and the Pagan idols were removed from the Ka'ba. (630 A.D.)

Two years later, Mohammed died.

#### DELHI to GRANADA

Historians have never seemed able to explain the terrific expansive force of Mohammed's influence. Hilaire Belloc says with loathing that it “arose out of nothing, out of the hot sands to the East and spread like a fire.” Carlyle marvels, “As if a spark had fallen, one spark on what seemed a world of black unnoticeable sand; but lo! the sand proves explosive powder and blazes high from Delhi to Granada!”

School books lay great emphasis on European history, ancient and modern, but no point is made of the fact that when Europe was stagnating in the so-called Dark Ages, the world was actually bright with a civilization more closely akin to what we have in America than anything that had gone before.

Millions upon millions, thirty generations of human beings, who believed in personal freedom, created that civilization and kept it going for eight hundred years.

These people were of all races and colors and classes, all creeds and all former cultures, all former empires.

On the deserts and the mountains and in the steamy fertile river valleys from the Ganges to the Atlantic they included Buddhists, Christians, Moslems, Jews, Hindus, Mongols, Chaldeans, Assyrians, Armenians, Persians, Medes, Arabs, Greeks, Egyptians, Phoenicians, Hittites, Africans and hundreds of others whose ancient ancestors had worn that soil to dust before the earliest dawn of history.

There is no one name that correctly applies to all of these people. The Europeans, who hated them, called them *Saracens*.

The records of the much maligned Saracens and their eight hundred years of civilization, their institutions, their methods, their ways of living – are locked in their common language, Arabic. Since American scholars are European-minded, an ordinary American can get only glimpses of the Saracens' world, seen through European misunderstanding and bitterness, dating back to the Crusades.

Because of the deep-seated prejudice, and in the interest of fair play, it seems appropriate to swing the pendulum the other way and present their side of the story – based mainly on information gathered by Mrs. Lane whose researches included personal contacts among surviving remnants of former Saracenic tribes.\*

## CONTRIBUTIONS

It is to the Saracens that the world of today owes much of its modern science – mathematics, astronomy, navigation, modern medicine and surgery, scientific agriculture. And their influence led to the discovery and exploration of America.

In the world of the Saracens no Authority suppressed scientists; no policeman harried them. (Nor did any government take care of them, either.) They opened schools,

---

\*

Almost everything in this chapter should be in "quotes" except that I have taken liberties in condensing Mrs. Lane's original text.

and from Baghdad to Granada, students crowded into them. Some of these schools grew into great universities and for hundreds of years continued to grow.

### LEARNING *versus* TEACHING

The Saracen universities had no formal organization (Mohammed contended that too much organization leads to corruption). The rules were few. There were no standardized programs, no regular curricula, no examinations.

To guard against the fallacious idea that education ends with graduation, the Saracens' schools gave no diplomas, no degrees. They were institutions, *not of teaching* but of *learning*. Students went there to get knowledge, just as Americans go to grocery stores to buy food.

Classes were held on an open-house basis. Anyone in quest of knowledge was free to wander about and listen. If he decided to remain he picked a teacher and privately discussed with him what he wanted to learn, what he should study, and agreed upon a fee. If, after joining the class, he didn't get the knowledge he wanted, he stopped paying the teacher and went to another teacher or another university.

After he had learned what he thought he ought to know, he would quit school *and put his new knowledge to practical test*.

For eight hundred years, the Saracens' schools and universities proceeded on the principle of freedom – on the basis of voluntary agreement between teacher and student. They offered all the learning of the past, with special emphasis on scientific knowledge.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the Saracens was their ability to *adapt from the experiences of others*. They studied the works of Aristotle, Galen, Euclid. They took unto themselves the past discoveries and techniques of the Greeks, the Chinese, the Romans and usually found ways to improve upon them.

For example, take the question of numerals: *The figures that you find on an adding machine – or on the upper row of typewriter keys – or at the top of the pages in this book are known as Arabic as against Roman numerals.*

Although handed down to us by the Saracenic Arabs, our numerals are really of Hindu origin.

The Greeks and the Romans had seen the Hindu symbols in India but they stuck to the clumsy Roman numerals, and continued to do their adding, subtracting and multiplying by clicking little balls along wires, as the Chinese still do. But not so with the Saracens. They seized upon the simple Hindu numbers and improved them. (It's only when people are free that they begin to look for labor-saving methods. See Page 187.)

## PRICELESS ZEROS

Not the least of the Saracens' contributions to our modern civilization is that their free minds were first to grasp the mathematical concept that the absence of a number – *nothing* – is a number.

They invented zero (0) without which science, as we know it today, could hardly exist.

Offhand that sounds a bit far-fetched, but think it over and ask yourself what would happen in this modern world of meticulous calculations if we were compelled to discard the ciphers and the decimal points and go back to Roman numerals.\*

Having established the concept of zero, the Saracens pro-

---

\* Today any mathematician will tell you that *without zero*, there could be no mathematics. Without zero, Americans could have no engineering, no chemistry, no astronomy, no adequate measurement of substance, time or space. Without zero there would be no skyscrapers, no subways, no modern bridges, no automobiles or radios. There would be no rayon, or cellophane – no aluminum, no electric refrigeration, no atomic power. Without zero, there could be no modern science – *no modern world.*



ceeded to develop arithmetic. Then they added algebra, including quadratics.

To Euclid's geometry they added plane geometry, spherical geometry and trigonometry. Applying these to sun, moon, and stars, they produced astronomy. Across three continents they built observatories – studied the heavens, recorded their observations, and put them to practical use.

## NAVIGATION

They deduced the shape and movement of the spinning earth around its axis and around the sun and gave to Europeans the information that the earth is round – along with calculations of its measurements. They invented the sextant and the magnetic compass which made it possible for them to navigate their vessels on the open seas – beyond the sight of land.

*And they provided Christopher Columbus with the instruments and the charts that he took with him when he sailed west in search of a new route to India.*

The Saracens' calculations of latitude were very accurate but on longitude not quite so good – which caused Columbus and his backers considerable embarrassment. (See Page 114.)

If alive today, the Saracen navigator of a thousand years ago would have little trouble understanding the charts and instruments on the most modern ocean liner. He would see improvements, but about the only instrument that would really baffle him is the gyro-compass. He'd be able to use it all right, but he wouldn't understand the electric energy that keeps it spinning.

**R**IVALLING THEIR WORK IN ASTRONOMY AND NAVIGATION, the Saracens made important contributions in the field of health and sanitation. They translated Galen's works into Arabic for use in their schools and did original research in

medicine and surgery. Nine hundred years ago they were using the medical pharmacopoeia of today, excepting only the recently discovered chemical compounds. There was not another great advance in medicine from the time of the Saracens until the American century.

From the Ganges to the Atlantic, they built medical schools and hospitals. While one of these was flourishing at Salerno, Italians a little further north are credited with doing the first surgical operations ever performed in Europe.

Since dissection was forbidden in Europe, the Italians doubtless learned their anatomy from the Saracens. Surely no doctor, even in the Dark Ages, would have had the nerve to cut open an important patient without some notion of what he was going to find inside.

It was the Saracens who discovered the local anesthetics used in these operations. The next great attack upon pain was the discovery of general anesthesia, first used in a surgical operation by Dr. Crawford Long in 1842, at Jefferson, Georgia.

In the 13th century the Doges of Venice are credited with the invention of quarantine against contagious disease and that also is out of keeping with the religious thought then prevailing in Europe – which held that pestilence was God's punishment for sin.

The explanation lies in the fact that the thriving city of Venice was carrying on a prosperous trade with the realistic Saracens.

Indeed, it is significant that the whole Renaissance, the so-called "revival of learning in Europe," should have "arisen" so inexplicably in the long, narrow peninsula of Italy with Saracen civilization brilliant at its tip, and with its every port opening to the Saracens' sea.

**P**RECISELY ONE HUNDRED YEARS after Mohammed died, some of the Saracens moved into central France. A frantically assembled European army attacked and stopped them near Tours. But they remained in southern France, and in Spain.

The fanatic Europeans looked upon them as anti-Christ, the Mystic Body of Satan on earth, and the Saracens regarded the Europeans as crude barbarians.

In Spain, the Saracens built great centers of learning and art, science, production and commerce, at Cordova, Granada and Seville. From India and Africa and Cathay, students came to the universities of Spain, and from Spain students went to the universities in Cairo, Baghdad and Delhi.

Farmers in fertile southern Spain poured into the cities an increasing abundance of foods and raw materials, and out of the cities poured an increasing wealth of woolens and linens and cottons and silks, mosaics, enamels, porcelains, glass and gloves. Ships thronged the harbors, unloading spices, ivory and camphor from India; tempered steel and wrought silver and brass from Damascus; horses from Arabia and saddles of leather softer than velvet, from Morocco across the straits.

*Progress continued for 500 years – until Saracenic Spain was three times as old as the United States are today. Then from darkest Europe a half million fighting men set out to attack the Saracens in far-away Palestine.*

This unprovoked aggression began a world war that lasted until the United States Marines subdued the "Barbary Pirates" in the Mediterranean harbor of Tripoli in the year 1804. Pirates they were but they didn't know it. They thought they were still fighting the war which the Europeans had launched against their forefathers.

FOR MORE THAN A CENTURY, officials of The Church had been trying their best to make peace in Europe. First, they decreed the Peace of God; but no one paid any attention. They then declared the Truce of God which called for a long week-end lasting from Wednesday night until Monday morning.

The idea was that if the ruling classes – the barons and the knights – could be induced to take that much time out from their fighting – then, on the off days, the farmers and craftsmen and the traders would have a chance to work in peace – and maybe provide enough food to keep things going. Sunday, of course, was the Lord's Day, but on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays the barons and the knights could get on with the job of heckling one another, fighting for their frontiers, and in the process killing off the useful peasants and serfs.

It was a good idea, but it didn't work out because The Church wasn't strong enough to enforce it.

So Pope Urban II (perhaps in sheer desperation) summoned all the barons to a great council and made a speech that roused them to frenzy. He called on them to put aside their petty quarrels and join themselves in the common cause to "Free the Holy Land!" He offered forgiveness of all sins to every man who enlisted, and promised eternal reward to any who died in the effort. His speech deeply moved his listeners and aroused a natural yearning to get out of Europe and into Heaven.

The result was an outburst of fervor and fanaticism, the like of which the world has never known – either before or since.

THE SARACENS had held the Holy Land for five hundred years and during all that time Christians had worshiped unmolested at its Christian shrines. Jerusalem has always been a Holy City to Moslems, who have a deep reverence

for Abraham, Moses, Gideon, Samuel, and Christ. Christian shrines are Moslem shrines.\*

But these facts were evidently unknown to the Crusaders who were dominated by the spirit of the vigilance committee gone amuck.

After killing Jews and non-believers all through the Germanies, nearly half a million Crusaders crossed the Bosphorus into Turkey. They besieged Nicea, but the Christian Emperor in Constantinople allied himself with the Saracens and sent his troops to defend the city.

Then the Crusaders moved on to ancient Antioch. They devastated the country so thoroughly that they almost starved themselves and it is reported that under the eyes of the guards on Antioch's walls, some of them cooked and ate the flesh of Saracens they had killed.

They were unable to take the city by force but a *Christian commander of Moslem troops* let them in secretly – by night. They massacred most of the population and while bodies rotted in the streets and wells, a mysterious sickness came upon them, and they resumed their march toward Jerusalem.

Along the way they were astonished to find that the homes and villages were all deserted. How did the Saracens know they were coming?

This was a land of Devils and black magic. Their worst

---

\* "Night and day for a thousand years (except at Easter) a Moslem has stood guard at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and did when I was in Jerusalem. On Easter Day the guard retires so that no Moslem presence profanes this holy time. Christians of all the rival sects crowd the dark cavern of the Church, each group allotted to its space. Then, in the black dark, the miracle occurs – fire bursts from the tomb. Rushing to catch the miraculous flame on their candles, the sects trespass on space allotted other sects, and in murderous fury Christians fight Christians and blood flows in the holy sepulchre. Then at sunset, when Easter Day is over, the Moslem guard returns and all is peaceful for another year." – R.W.L.

suspicious were confirmed when an envoy from the Sultan of faraway Egypt met them enroute with a conciliatory message urging that they fulfill their vow to the Pope and enter Jerusalem as peaceful and welcome pilgrims.

But it was south of Beirut where they saw the black magic *with their own eyes*. In the skies overhead, a hawk had wounded a pigeon. The pigeon fell to the ground. Attached to its leg the incredulous Crusaders found a silver cylinder containing a bit of paper with mysterious writing which a Syrian Christian guide translated for them. It said:

*"The Emir of Akka to the Lord of Caesarea. Greeting: A race of dogs, stupid and quarrelsome, hath passed my way, moving without order. As thou lovest the Faith, do what thou mayest (and have others do) all that may hurt them. Send this word to other citadels and fortresses." \**

**I**N TWO YEARS, the Crusaders had fought two battles and a few skirmishes. They had unsuccessfully besieged two cities, and had taken Antioch by treachery. Out of almost 500,000 invaders only 30,000 reached Palestine.

There they found the palm groves, the vineyards, and the orchards of figs and sweet pomegranates, but the villages and towns and white-walled Ramlah were deserted. A hundred Crusaders rode into Bethlehem and found it a Christian town built around the Cathedral of the Virgin Mary. Monks and priests entertained them royally. Then they rode back toward Jerusalem, and came to the peaceful Church of the Blessed Mother of Christ in the ancient Garden of Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives.

\*

---

From "The Chronicle of the Anonymous," quoted by Harold Lamb in *The Crusades: Iron Men and Saints*.—Doubleday, Doran, 1931.

For five weeks they attacked gray-walled Jerusalem on its heights. From thirty miles away they hauled timbers and built movable battle towers, and under a rain of boiling pitch and Greek fire they advanced their towers and rushed across blazing drawbridges to engage in hand-to-hand fighting on the walls. They took the Holy City, and for two days and nights they slaughtered men, women and children in houses and in churches, down the alleys, over the roofs. And on the sunken pavement around the Mosque of Omar, their horses charged fetlock-deep in human blood.

Only one little group of citizens survived the massacre. They were of Christian faith. Huddled together, awaiting death, unable to speak the foreign tongue of the bloody killers, they sang a mass in Greek, and the Crusaders, recognizing the tune, swerved by and left them alive.

**T**HE CRUSADERS FOUND CHRISTIANS everywhere they went – *for the simple reason that Christians had been there all along.* For a thousand years Christians had been living peacefully among the Moslems – along with Armenians, Albanians, Greeks, Copts, Marenites, Druses, Jews, Parsees, Hindus, to mention a few.

*“Use no violence in religion,”* Mohammed had cautioned. *“Fight for the religion of God against those who attack you, but transgress not by attacking them first.”*

It was the Europeans who had the habit of starting wars and it was the Europeans who massacred heretics, down to the last infant. They killed the Albigenses, the Waldensians, the Socinians, the Huguenots, the Covenanters, and many others. Five hundred years after the Crusades, both Protestants and Catholics were alternately seeking refuge in the American wilderness to save their lives from European fanaticism.

BEFORE TAKING JERUSALEM the Crusaders met the Saracens only once in open battle. From then on they respected them. In contrast to the bludgeoning Europeans, they wore light helmets of Damascene steel, and body-armor of gilded steel mesh that would turn the swiftest arrow, but which was so sheer that a whole suit of it crumpled into scarcely more than a handful. The Saracen fighters were lean, agile, quick, and rode small horses as swift as their thin, flexible swords.

The iron-armored ranks of Christendom would charge forward with a full-throated roar, “God wills it!” But the Saracens, flying their green silk banners, swept like a wave and struck at the flank, calling out a ululating cry that sounded to the Crusaders like the howl of wolves: “*La ilaha illa'llah!* — there is but one God.”

WHEN THE CRUSADERS went out of Jerusalem to attack Ascalon, they were already adopting the Saracens' battle tactics. But they were still unable to guess the uses of their loot.

At Antioch their bewilderment had been pitiable. They sat down on beds and leapt up terrified by a movement beneath them; they had never seen a mattress. They were mystified by the draperies, carpets, cushions, leathers, linens — magical chiffons that clung like cobwebs to their fingers, and a silk that changed its color in the light.

The unknown metals and strange utensils were equally puzzling. Gingerly they sniffed at flaming liquids in queer containers. *They had never seen an oil lamp before.*

They tasted and spat out a white powder, delicious but perhaps poisonous. It was sugar.

In small gold boxes and tubes with jewelled stoppers they found other strong-tasting substances. How could they understand cosmetics? (The cosmetics used by the Saracen women were quite similar to those of today. No other women



in history were so well-groomed, until the present generation of Americans.)

In contrast to the European castles, with rude stone walls and floors littered with rotting reeds and bones, the Crusaders came into rooms like jewels, the floors tiled, the ceilings mosaic.

Delicate lattice-work let one look out through a window, though no one could look in, and faintly scented air came through. The lattice was of sandalwood.

Rummaging and wondering, dragging out and killing some quivering thing, a child or a slave, the invaders came upon cups which they mistook for rare jewels, and in the excited grip, they crushed to splinters that cut the hand. (For the first time they learned about glass.)

This, indeed, was a country of demons and devils; all Europeans heard that it was.

The most amazing thing, however, must have been the cleanliness. It seemed that everyone was always bathing. A Crusader knew what it was to get wet in the rain or when crossing a river, and the knights recalled the formal bath that had been a part of the ceremonial into knighthood.

But the heathen Moslems bathed five times a day.

It was Mohammed's idea; he was almost fanatically clean. Probably in reaction from the filthy Christian ascetics of the time, he had insisted that a clean, healthy body is essential to a clear mind and pure spirit, and as a part of his plan to keep religion on an informal, personalized basis, he tied physical cleanliness to prayer. Let every man repeat five times daily the truth that there is One God (no pagan gods) and before saying this, let him wash in running water. He pointed out that one cannot wash clean in standing water because it becomes dirty.

Then, with a practical eye to trade, he added that men travelling through the deserts should scrub themselves with sand.

SO THE CRUSADERS CAME INTO A COUNTRY where everyone was clean and always bathing. Fountains were everywhere, for Moslems sensibly did not interrupt business to recall that there are no pagan gods; they bathed and repeated that fact in their streets and bazaars.

Anyone or any group who wanted a fountain, built one. Everything was on a basis of individual initiative and voluntary cooperation.\*

Mosques were built in the same spontaneous way. There was no more organization about a mosque than there was about a Saracen university. Men in the neighborhood keep the mosque in repair if they like; if they don't, it falls to ruin in time. Philosophers, poets and idlers sit in its quiet courtyard by the splashing fountain. At dawn, noon, and sunset, and in mid-morning and mid-afternoon, one climbs the minaret and calls out that there is no God but God. Beneath him in the city or countryside, everyone pauses and repeats the fact. Some repeat it in the mosque, after bathing at its fountain; someone may read aloud from the Koran, or not.

Theirs was a spontaneous religion based on a sense of reality, springing from and depending upon the personal self. And for eight hundred years during the period when the greater part of Europe was submerged in the Dark Ages, it produced the most brilliant scientific progress and the greatest material prosperity that had ever been known to man.

---

\* It should be borne in mind that Mohammed lived in the period 570 to 632 - about 800 years before the art of printing began to gain headway. Thus, his teachings have been variously interpreted and confused with the superstition and mysticism that characterized the Dark Ages. For example, the story of his going to the mountain when the mountain would not come to him, most likely had its origin in Mohammed's insistence that the individual should do things for himself instead of waiting for help from the supernatural - or *from men in public office*.

**I**MAGINE THE CRUSADING KNIGHT who, after grabbing a kingdom in Syria, is dining for the first time in the palace of a neighboring Emir. The knight is wearing harsh leather, coarse wool and eighty pounds of iron armor on his unwashed body. He is used to gnawing meat from the bone, tossing the bone over his shoulder to the dogs, then wiping greasy hands on his sleeves and guzzling down a hornful of ale.

The courtyards, halls and rooms no longer amaze him. They are like those he had looted. But what would he do, when a servant offered him a silver bowl and held poised above it a silver pitcher?

Before the Saracen ate, rose-scented water was poured over his hands, and he wiped them on linen damask or terry-cloth (our bath-towel). A servant placed an inlaid metal tray between host and guest, and set on it a porcelain bowl of food. The Saracen ate with his fingers, as Europeans did, but he did not wipe them on his clothes. After each course, he washed them again and dried them on a fresh towel.

Not one dog sat scratching fleas and whining for bones. The floor of polished stone was bright and shining. On a raised dais, the host and guest sat on thick-piled oriental rugs, richly colored and spotlessly clean. (Before a Saracen entered a house, he always left his shoes outside.)

The foods were amazing and strange. The meats were various and cooked with seasonings and sauces. There were salads, and ices. There was an unknown drink, in tiny cups. (It was coffee, sugared and spiced.) No European had ever before seen the variety of cereals, vegetables, fruits that the Saracens ate. They included rice, spinach, asparagus, lemons, melons, peaches – produced by the world's first scientific farmers.

In Europe, oxen and women pulled wooden plows that scratched the earth; and the crop was whatever God might

will. Half the farmland always lay fallow, because giving birth to a crop tires the earth and it must rest.

But in the world of the Saracens, not an acre of arable land ever rested. From Cathay to the Atlantic, across three continents, the Saracen farmers were deep-plowing and contour-plowing, fertilizing, irrigating, and rotating their crops. They poured into the markets an abundance of nearly every food that we have today, and took in return a wealth of goods such as the world had never known before.

These goods included damask linens, mohair, muslin, Syrian silks, morocco leather, oriental rugs, mosaics, inlaid woods, glassware, porcelains, enamels, filigree and wrought work in metals. Damascene steel was not equalled until very recently in these United States.

Americans owe directly to the Saracens our Californian and Southwestern architecture, our cotton industry, our asphalt paving, and a long list of such things as beds, tables, table and bed linens, divans, sofas, glass, china, rugs, strawberries, peaches, ice-cream. We speak Arabic when we say *mattress, cotton, talcum, sugar, coffee, sherbet, naphtha, gypsum, benzine*. Our cars run, our streets are paved, our houses furnished and our bodies clothed with things that the Saracens began to create a thousand years ago.

**J**ERUSALEM WAS THE FIRST OF THE KINGDOMS established by the Crusaders and the Christian kings were able to hold it with fewer than a hundred soldiers.

As time went on, the invaders were dressing and living like the Moslems. They melted into the civilization of the Saracens and their sons grew up so tolerant that they *raised no objection to Moslems worshipping in the Christian churches*.

But the new kingdoms set up by the Crusaders lasted less

than a century: Then the Emir of Palestine (who was a Kurd) proposed an alliance with England. He offered his sister in marriage to Richard the Lion-Hearted, who was crusading at the time. But Richard was planning to return to England and in spite of all his Lion-Heartedness, he lacked the courage to face his fanatical subjects with a Moslem Queen!

Upon his refusal, the Moslems attacked and took Jerusalem, but they did not sack it. As soon as its defenders surrendered, the Emir released his prisoners unharmed and gave them forty days to dispose of their property and go back home. During these forty days, the people of Jerusalem bitterly complained that the departing Christians were stealing everything they could lay hands on; and demanded that the robbery be stopped. The Emir replied, "If I stop them, they will say that I have broken my word. Let us give them an opportunity to praise the goodness of our religion."

He left to the people the responsibility of protecting their individual property, and the Europeans got away with quite a lot of loot.

*But they also took back something that was of far greater value. It was a new concept of sportsmanship and gentility which they had learned from the Saracens.*

## CHIVALRY

Prior to the Crusades the invaders had never known that a strong man need not be brutal.

The Saracens were fierce in battle, but they were not cruel; they did not kill the wounded, they did not torture their prisoners; when they struck down an opponent it was not uncommon to help him up. (Read Sir Walter Scott.) They did not persecute Christians. And they were honorable; they told the truth, they kept their word.

The English Knights were especially impressed and, due in no small measure to the lessons learned from the Sara-

cens, the British aristocracy developed into one of the finest ruling classes that the world has ever known.\*

**I**N THE MEANTIME subversive ideas were leaking into Europe out of Saracen Spain. Travelers from south of the Pyrenees brought them into France and the Germanies, and European scholars were corresponding with Saracen scholars in the Spanish universities.

*One of these dangerous ideas was that the earth is round - a planet among many planets spinning in space.*

This was contrary to the accepted teachings of the times, which were based on the pagan belief that Authority controls all things, including men. Such heresies must be suppressed, and in most of Europe they *were* suppressed.

But the Italians were prospering from their trade with the Saracens and they continued to deal with these men of greater knowledge and wider experience. The Saracens had better methods of navigating ships, quicker ways of computing costs and adding up bills. They transacted their business affairs over great distances and with incredible swiftness.

A European who traveled eighteen miles in one day had something to write home about (had he known how to write). But a Saracen thought nothing of sending a parcel two hundred miles and getting back a receipt on the following day.

A thousand years ago, the Saracen pony express habitually covered two hundred miles a day, anywhere on land from

\*

---

One of the returning Crusaders - an Englishman named Wilder, whose life had been chivalrously saved by an Arab foe - decreed that the name of his rescuer should be carried down through each succeeding generation of the Wilder family. Thus it is that Rose Wilder Lane's father bears the name Almanzo - (the original was probably *El Manzoor*). I got this story, not from Mrs. Lane, but out of one of the delightful children's books written by her mother, Laura Ingalls Wilder, and I suspect that the daughter's deep interest in the Saracens stems from the family tradition.

the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean. In a pinch it could do two thousand miles in eight days. Such speed over such a distance was not equalled until the pony express ran from St. Joseph, Missouri, to San Francisco in the year 1860.

The Saracens' postal service was even swifter. Today you can see a remnant of it in Ragusa (Dubrovnik) on the Dalmatian coast. Ragusa was one of the Free Cities that traders had set up in Italy just before the Renaissance. It is important to notice that trade – the exchange of material goods – is always an exercise of individual freedom. Production and trade are possible only to the extent that restraints upon personal freedom are removed.

The Free Cities were the only spots in Europe where men could manage their own affairs and it was in these spots where religious freedom began to take root. While most of Europe was being torn with fanaticism and religious jealousies, traders of all faiths were building their churches in Ragusa: *a Roman Catholic Church, a Greek Catholic Church, a Moslem Mosque and fountain.*

Even today, under the arcade of the ancient market place, above the door that led to the offices of the city, you can see a painting of Mother Ragusa, the Free City. The colors are still clear and fresh. Grouped around Mother Ragusa's knees, and equally enclosed by her arms, are children of all peoples; the Norman, the Mongol, the African, the Slav and the Levantine.

Below the portrait stands a marble bench on which three judges sat every day, to hear and judge in public any complaints brought before them. They represented the Free City. They were bound to judge all men with an equal justice.

Ragusa prospered enormously. Its merchants rivaled and often outstripped the Venetians. When an earthquake totally demolished the city in the 16th century, they rebuilt it so rapidly that prosperity was hardly interrupted. Ragusa was so rich and powerful that Spain sought the little city as

an ally, and ships from Ragusa sailed with the Spanish Armada against England.

While rebuilding their city after the earthquake, the merchants improved its postal service. They built dove cotes all along the top of the city's double walls, and thousands of pigeons still flutter around them.

In common with other Saracen cities, Ragusa required every foreigner to contribute two carrier pigeons from his home town as an entrance fee at the city gates. These pigeons were filed in the dove cotes, under the name of their home. When ships from Ragusa went to sea, or when caravans set out on the long road to China, they took with them as many Ragusan pigeons as might be required to pay the entrance fees to other cities and bring back their reports. By carrier pigeon mail the salesman reported sales, trade news, business prospects, and his next address. Back at the "home office" in Ragusa, the replies, in sealed cylinders, were turned over to the *pigeon-master* who selected the proper pigeon to reach the salesman's next address.

This highly efficient postal service covered land and sea from Spain to India. For speed and privacy it was not surpassed until Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone.

**R**OMAN POST ROADS ARE JUSTLY FAMOUS, and were excellent for their purpose, which was military. They were useful to the Roman State, and to privileged families and classes.

What is not so well known is that the Saracens built networks of highways to serve the practical needs of commerce and to connect their cities which are still among the most beautiful in the world.

While their architects were creating dreams in marble, scholars collected and exchanged rare manuscripts; and



traders extended their business throughout the civilized world. And all these complexes of free human energies, operating across three continents, were geared to the speed of pigeon's flight.

The dynamic civilization of the Saracens had never been equalled and was not surpassed until 300 years after it ceased to exist.

### *Why did it cease to exist?*

The answer or answers to that question should be highly valuable in advancing the American effort to establish on this earth the principles of freedom and liberty, and although hundreds of books have been written on the Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans, so far as I can discover, no historical analyst has ever developed a realistic account of the rise and fall of the Saracen civilization.

The barriers of language and the deep-seated prejudices handed down from the time of the Crusades have obscured the important lessons that might be learned from this second attempt to set men free, and the difficulty is increased by the fact that some of the reasons for its success are interwoven with the causes of its failure.

On the positive side it seems that the anarchy of the Saracens, in contrast to that of the Israelites, was surrounded by certain restraints and tempered with a belief in human brotherhood.

The majority of the people who were drawn together in the world of the Saracens had already been living in groups and they brought to their new civilization all the traditional customs and habits of human association and human brotherhood inherited from the wide diversity of tribes and empires that had previously existed in the vast area between the Ganges and the Atlantic.

Thus, their anarchy might be described as the anarchy of groups rather than the anarchy of persons. Individuals were

not prevented from acting freely, but it seems that most of them chose to remain in tribal and family groups, voluntarily obeying many forms of authority that could not be enforced.

The different groups kept their old customs and traditions. They increased the natural authority of parents over children, and the natural influence of wise and able men. Workers, traders, scholars and others formed fraternal groups. The Saracens were great "joiners."\*

They accepted Mohammed's liberal views as rules of personal conduct and as a guide to human association along informal lines. There were the Emirs who led their troops of volunteer militia and each served as the political leader for his group. There were the Caliphs – the word means Successor (to Mohammed) and there were the Cadis, or wise men, upon whom their neighbors relied for judgment.

"A westerner," observes Mrs. Lane, "who has seen a quarrel flare up in a bazaar will never forget it. Suddenly from the humming din, one voice rises above the others, angry, menacing. For an instant there is total silence; then a mob-roar, 'Brothers, you are brothers! Moslems, remember you are brothers!' With this roar goes a mob-rush. (Get out of it, quick.)

---

\*

This same tendency is strikingly characteristic of Americans who, as the intellectuals sneeringly observe, are the greatest "joiners" on earth. The American Babbitt spontaneously creates literally tens of thousands of free and voluntary associations of persons who act together for some mutual purpose: Ladies Aids, country clubs, Masons, Knights of Columbus, Odd Fellows, building-and-loan associations, mutual banks, farmers' co-operatives, labor unions, Chambers of Commerce, D.A.R., P.T.A., N.A.A.C.P. – *the list is endless*. These free associations form the fabric of American social life; nearly every American belongs to several of them. The whole American industry and commerce is organized on this same basis of free, mutual cooperation. General Electric, General Motors, U. S. Steel, Bell Telephone, Standard Oil, and the smallest store with one clerk, alike were created and are maintained by the free will of persons working with others for a common purpose – *voluntarily accepting an authority which is not and cannot be enforced upon a single one of them*.

“Scores of hands tear the quarreling men apart, snatch their weapons from their hands or sashes. In a moment the din of bargaining begins again. Volunteers have surrounded the angry men and escorted them to the nearest Cadi, who can keep his reputation for wisdom only by settling the quarrel *then and there* – and in a way that satisfies everyone’s sense of justice.

“You admire the method because it works. Actually it is the way in which men, always, keep the peace when no one has the recognized duty to protect their rights by using force. It is the way in which Americans kept the peace on the frontier, and keep it now on hunting trips and in club rooms.

*“But it rests on personal judgment. It is not law, and it has its limitations.”*

**A**N ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE between American and Saracen civilization appears in the marriage customs. Among the Saracens, marriage was made by family agreement, with the consent of bride and groom. It was not a religious sacrament. Nor was it a civil contract, despite the fact that a Moslem marriage included property settlements from both families.

If it later became necessary to enforce the terms it was up to the aggrieved family to do the enforcing as best it could. There was no legal machinery – no impersonal third party to whom to appeal. The only protection of property seems to have been *possession of the property, personal honesty and public opinion.*

This is not so unusual as it may seem. The basic protection of life and property – law or no law, always and everywhere – depends on the general recognition of human rights – *life, liberty and ownership.*

On the American frontier, before there were any laws, settlers didn’t bother to lock their cabins and the average

citizen of today is not often within sight of a policeman.

But in a complex civilization, human nature being what it is, the need sometimes arises for the impersonal third party, and the policeman is a handy person to have around. His existence is a symbol of law and order – a reminder that the Bad Man will not be tolerated.

The Saracens had no police force. They had no State to defend their civilization by military power. They had no civil law which men could rally to defend. There was no organization or political structure to hold together the millions of persons who for 800 years had been creating the vast and complex empire extending over three continents.


But in spite of their many shortcomings, there is no denying that the Saracens made a good Second Attempt, and it should be remembered that their civilization had its beginning and reached its peak during the period when continental Europe was submerged in the barbarism of the Dark Ages.

**B**UT THE DAYS OF THE SARACENS WERE NUMBERED. Medieval Europeans had broken through the Pyrenees, and the spirit of the Crusaders, in a white heat of religious fanaticism, was directed against the Saracens of Spain. Bloody killings, torture, purges and mass deportation went on for years.

At the mercy of the Inquisitors in the West, and disrupted at the center by the barbarous attacks of the Turks, the world of the Saracens sank into stagnation.

*But in the wake of these disintegrating events,  
there followed a highly significant result.*

## Prelude to Third Attempt



Through Italy, the Saracens had given Europeans “*the awakening of science and learning*” that lifted them out of the Dark Ages – and through Spain the last of their energy led to the development of a New World. The discovery, exploration and early colonization of America are closely tied up with the Spanish Inquisition. As an instrument of church discipline, the Inquisition had its beginning early in the 13th century, but south of the

Pyrenees it had met with considerable opposition.

The people of Spain were different from the Europeans. For hundreds of years they had been living in an atmosphere of freedom and religious tolerance.

But European ideas of bigotry, class hatred and authoritarian control were leaking in from the north. And the new monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, were interested in strengthening their power. So in 1480 the Inquisition was taken over *as an instrument of government* – under their personal supervision, supported by police and military force.

It was just three years later when Christopher Columbus, after having been turned down by the King of Portugal, put his proposition up to Spain. But Ferdinand and Isabella were so busy waging war against the Moslems and the Jews that they had no time to bother with outside ventures.

Things dragged along for almost a decade until the last of the Saracen strongholds fell in January 1492.

It was the beautiful city of Granada – the great fountain

of learning, science, art, architecture and commerce which the Saracens had been creating for 800 years.

After a nine month siege, and worn down by starvation, Granada had finally surrendered and it was behind the trenches in an army camp just outside Granada that Columbus finally closed the deal that was to change the course of world events.

The Saracens had now been divested of their political status and their properties were being confiscated. But their influence down through centuries of trade and intermarriage was deeply ingrained and the conflict of Authority versus Freedom did not end with the fall of Granada.

In the years following the discovery of America, the activities of the Spanish Inquisitors became so widespread and so relentless that even the most devout and highly respected Christian citizen could not be sure of escaping persecution.

Thus, many who would normally have stayed at home, chose to join the conquistadors rather than run the risk of falling into the hands of the Inquisitors.\*

*But that's getting ahead of the story.*

**O**F COURSE, AS MRS. LANE REMINDS US, Columbus did not discover America — at least, not in the usual sense. Irishmen, Danes, Norwegians, Basques and at least one Spaniard had seen this country ahead of Columbus. She suggests that the Breton fishermen refilled their water casks every season from the streams of New England and tells of an ancient

---

\*

Back home you were in for trouble if someone dropped the hint that you were a Moslem sympathizer or casually remarked that your neck looked unusually clean. The informer wouldn't have to appear against you in person but he would get a share of your property in case of conviction. For intimate sidelights read the historical novel "Captain from Castile" by Samuel Shellabarger. Sun Dial Press, Garden City, N. Y.

map preserved in Venice, Italy, drawn several centuries before Columbus was born, which clearly shows the coast line of Newfoundland correctly where it is.

## NORTHERN GATEWAY

America had been reached any number of times by the Northern Route. From Britain or Norway, the distance to Iceland is about 600 miles and from there on it's a matter of island hopping.

On exceptionally clear days the mountains of Greenland are visible from Iceland. The distance is only 150 miles and once having reached Greenland it's not much of a jump to Baffin Island, then down the coast to Labrador and to the shores of New England.

So it is only natural that Iceland should have been the original gateway to the New World and among the most daring feats of exploration are the early voyages across 600 miles of the North Atlantic before the time of the magnetic compass.

No one knows who first discovered Iceland but it seems that a navigator named Pytheas, in the year 330 B.C., made a voyage from Marseilles, France, through the Straits of Gibraltar, northward past the British Isles to what was called "Ultima Thule" - which meant the supposed end of the world.

Pytheas probably reached Iceland but it doesn't necessarily follow that he made the original discovery. According to folklore, land was known to exist in that part of the world even before the time of Pytheas.

## HOEI SIN, *et al*

In his recent book "Great Adventures and Explorations" Vilhjalmur Stefansson gives many interesting sidelights on the pre-Columbus voyages:

Ancient records in China indicate that the seafaring

monk, Hœi Sin, crossed the Pacific along the shore lines of Kamchatka and the Aleutian Islands – reaching the coast of Canadian British Columbia in the year 499 A.D.

An Irish priest named Brendan made a voyage to Greenland in about 550 A.D. Iceland was colonized in 870 A.D. and Greenland in 986. Leif Ericson, Karlsefni and others reached the shores of the North American continent during the period 1000 to 1010.

And just one more startling fact that should appeal to Robert Ripley:

An ancient stone slab discovered in recent years near Kensington, Minnesota, bears an inscription to the effect that a party of Scandinavian explorers had penetrated to the very center of the North American continent in the year 1362 – *more than a century before Columbus reached the east coast islands in the Caribbean.*\*

### 3500 versus 600

Yes, America had been discovered any number of times prior to 1492. But that's no discredit to Columbus and so far

\*

The so-called Kensington Rune Stone was found entwined in the roots of an aged tree stump in the year 1898, but for a long time it was used as the threshold for a farmer's barn. Then it came to the attention of Hjalmar Holand of Ephraim, Wisconsin, who has deciphered the inscription as follows:

"[We are] 8 Goths [Swedes] and 22 Norwegians on an exploratory journey from Vinland through the West. We had camped by [a lake with] 2 skerries one day's journey north from this stone. We were [out] and fished one day. After [when] we came home [we] found 10 [of our] men red with blood and dead. Ave Maria, save [us] from evil."

That is the inscription on the face of the stone. On one edge are the lines:

"[We] have 10 of [our party] by the sea to look after our ship fourteen days' journey from this island [in the] year 1362."

Mr. Holand has written a most interesting book about the Kensington Rune Stone and various other evidences of ancient Scandinavian explorations in the Hudson Bay area; "Westward From Vinland," Duell, Sloan & Pearce, N.Y.C., 1940. A less complete account is given in Stefansson's "Great Adventures and Explorations," The Dial Press, 1947.



as is known, he was first to make the voyage by the Southern Route – across the full expanse of the Atlantic – about 3500 miles of open sea as against the 600 mile jump to Iceland.

Columbus was doubtless familiar with some of the earlier explorations. In 1477 he had made a voyage to Iceland – and perhaps beyond. But Columbus was not interested in discovering a new continent. He was trying to find a *new route to India*.

The Crusades had shown that the riches of the world were in the East and Marco Polo had brought back fabulous reports on India and China.

The Eastern Route was long and the militant Turks blocked the way. Portuguese seamen were trying to find a passage around Southern Africa. Others had suggested that it should be possible to reach the Orient by sailing westward across the Atlantic.

Among the Saracens, it was common knowledge that the earth was round. They had taken the theories of Aristotle and other Greek philosophers, reduced them to scientific observation and applied their findings to the practical problems of navigation.

The Saracens' knowledge of astronomy had been passed along to the European scholars and was generally accepted by them although they had to be cautious in expressing their views.

#### DISCRETION *versus* VALOR

The Authority of the European rulers was based on the idea of a static universe. To accept the new-fangled notion that the earth spins in space would be admitting the possibility of energy, change and progress. Such heretical doctrines must be suppressed.

That is why Roger Bacon, the 13th century "Father of modern Science" spent much of his life in jail. That is why the discreet friends of Copernicus published his discoveries

as mere “mathematical abstractions.” That is why the less discreet, the more outspoken, the *downright rambunctious* Galileo fell into the hands of the Inquisitors and escaped torture only by retracting his statements.

#### ABLE INDIVIDUALIST

Columbus didn't discover that the earth was round any more than he discovered America but that again is nothing to his discredit.

Columbus was quite a person. A combination of circumstances gave him the big opportunity – and his experience, knowledge, energy and perseverance enabled him to make the most of it. (At least up to a point.)

Columbus was a Genoese sailor, born and raised among the sea-faring Saracens.

He was a man of vision and courage who combined the qualities of an able navigator, a great explorer, a capable executive and a top-notch promoter.

To the money-mad Ferdinand, Columbus held out promises of gold and riches.

To the devout Isabella he emphasized the opportunities for uniting the ends of the earth beneath the Sign of The Cross.

Himself a devout Christian and student of the Scriptures, Columbus supported his charts and maps with Biblical quotations pointing out that “In several passages of the Holy Writ, God plainly speaks of these regions through the mouth of His Prophet, Isaiah, when He declares that His Name shall be proclaimed from the one end of the earth onwards.”

**Spain, at the time, *was* the one end of the earth.**

“ADMIRAL OF THE OCEAN SEA”\*

Columbus had such great confidence in his project that he refused to budge on his terms, which were: *A Super-Admiral's commission with all expenses paid in advance; vice-regal authority over all new lands he reached, forever hereditary in his family; and ten per cent of all valuable metals ever found in those lands, to him and his heirs forever.*

That is what Columbus demanded and his proposition was finally accepted by the Spanish monarchs but not until after Columbus had threatened to open negotiations with France.

Of course the terms of the agreement were never fulfilled. Columbus was so busy trying to do a job that he was unable to hold his own against the political intrigue of the Spanish Court.

CENTRAL CONTROL

While on his third voyage he was the victim of a whispering campaign, charging him with mismanagement of the Hispaniola colony.

A successor, sent over to relieve him of his colonial duties, put Columbus in chains and loaded him on a ship bound for Spain.

As soon as the ship pulled out, its captain ordered the shackles removed, but Columbus, with quiet dignity, would not consent. *“I will continue wearing them until their Highnesses order their removal – and I will treasure them afterwards as memorials of the reward for my services.”*

According to his son Fernando, Columbus kept the shackles on display in his home up to the time of his death and expressed the wish that they be buried with him.

But that again is getting ahead of the story.

---

\* Translation of official title granted to Columbus – as reported by Samuel Eliot Morison who, in recent years, retraced the voyage of 1492 in a sea-going research expedition, incident to writing his excellent life of Columbus, *“Admiral of the Ocean Sea,”* Atlantic Monthly press, Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1946.

## MISHAP IN LONGITUDE

On August third 1492, just seven months after the fall of Granada, the Admiral of the Ocean Sea sailed confidently westward in search of the East.

The success of the voyage across thousands of miles of unknown sea would hardly have been possible except for the magnetic compass which had been developed by the Saracens.

His maps and navigation charts were also based on information supplied by the Saracens.

In longitude the data was inaccurate by some 8,000 miles. So when the Spice Islands didn't appear where they were charted, Columbus had to quell a mutiny.\*

When land was finally sighted it was approximately where the charts showed India to be, so he had no doubt that he had found a Western route to India.

## THE FOLLOW-THROUGH

Thus it was that Columbus discovered America, but as Mrs. Lane points out, "Columbus might have come and gone and made no more difference than Eric the Red, if human energy had not leaped from Saracenic Spain—if thousands of men had not taken their lives in their hands, and risked them, on their own responsibility in the great unknown."

The "follow-through" had always been lacking.

But after the voyage of Columbus, Spanish energy leaped the Atlantic, in the thousands of men and women who sailed

---

\* The Saracens had never needed any such measurements. They were not interested in sailing around the world to reach India. They were already there. But following the voyage of Columbus the need for accurate measurements of longitude became increasingly apparent. The problem was not solved until the middle of the 18th century when John Harrison, a Yorkshire carpenter, was awarded a £20,000 prize by the British Government for the development of an accurate chronometer which made practical the ingenious idea of measuring longitude on the basis of a zero position arbitrarily established at Greenwich, England.

with Cortes, Pizarro, Ponce de Leon, Coronado, Balboa, Magellan – all the explorers and conquistadors who put this hemisphere on the map and led the way around the earth – and in the thousands who marched with their leaders from the Gulf of Mexico to the Ohio River and from the Rio Grande to the Missouri, and came so near to meeting in Kansas in the year 1545 – just half a century after the Genoese Sailor had crossed the Ocean Sea and sighted an island that he mistook for India.

Youngsters like Hernando de Soto in his teens, riding away from home, alone on a lean horse, with only a sword and a spear and his fearless self-reliance. Hundreds and thousands of young men like that – *it was they who really discovered America.*

And they came only from the former land of the Saracens.

Europeans to the north could no longer doubt that the earth was round and they knew that the fabulously rich and strange half of it still waited to be explored. But for almost a century they did not stir. *Three generations of Europeans did not move from where they sat.*

**A**MERIGO VESPUCCI, who put one over on Columbus and gave America his name, was born and raised in Florence, Italy. He worked first for Spain and later for Portugal.

Another man came sailing under the English flag – followed a little later by his son, sailing under the same flag.

*But they were not Englishmen.* They are known to history as John and Sebastian Cabot but they were Venetians and their real name was *Caboto*. Like Christopher Columbus, they hailed from the heart of the Saracens' Mediterranean.

But nothing came of their efforts until the early 17th century and while England sank back into lethargy, the energetic Spaniards were making regular voyages to and from the new continent.

FOR ALMOST 800 YEARS the people of Spain had been living in close association with the Saracens in a civilization that did not prevent freedom of action and individual initiative.

The Saracens were now being liquidated but Spain still had some free cities and its citizens were not Europeans—at least, *not yet*.

The change that was being brought on by the Inquisition was only a change in *meaning* and it was slow in showing its effects. The spirit of individual freedom was too deeply rooted to die out overnight and the momentum of the energy that had been generated by the Saracens was applied to the outfitting of ships and armies.

The germs of that energy were being destroyed but wealth was beginning to flow in from the New World and the current prosperity obscured the deeper significance of what was happening beneath the surface.

#### NO TIME FOR THEORY

A prosperous glove manufacturer, say in Seville, would see no difference — except that business was on the boom.

If anyone had tried to point out the danger, he would doubtless have replied: “Oh, that’s just theories. I’m a busy man and this is no time to bother with theories. The glove market was never better. I’m on my way right now to land a big government contract.”

*But the Inquisitors were expanding their operations.*

Some two million Moslems remained in Spain; the King’s troops were called upon to make them Christians — at the point of the sword.

Tortured, slaughtered, burned alive in their blazing houses or rounded up when they fled, the surviving Moslems were converted. But they continued to follow their heathen customs — reading their Arabic books, playing their athletic games, wearing their silk robes, and bathing — *always bathing*.

Church and State strictly prohibited these practices. Police burned libraries and searched converts' homes for Arabic books to burn; they stopped the athletic sports. They converted the baths (our "Turkish baths") to other uses or razed them to the ground. Bathing in homes was strictly prohibited.

All this does not affect the rights of a person who does not know Arabic nor want to play games nor to bathe. *Or does it?*

Still it seemed that the converts, now called Moriscos, did not wholly accept Authority. They were suspected of bathing secretly. There was doubt as to their *inner* convictions. To discover what they really thought, the Inquisition was necessary.

It was all prompted by the best intentions. The Spanish Monarchs and their Grand Inquisitor considered themselves responsible for the salvation of each individual. Those whose minds were corrupted must be destroyed – *just as a good farmer must destroy a tubercular cow to protect the health of the herd.*

Responsibility must be accompanied by Authority to control the beliefs of the Moriscos – *and first it was necessary to know just what they believed.*

Psychological tests and lie-detectors had not been invented. Torture was the only means of finding out and torture often revealed a taint even in the minds of Spaniards who didn't even realize that they had Moslem leanings. Freedom of thought was found to be more prevalent than anyone had suspected.

Reforming the Moriscos seemed a hopeless task, and even after a hundred years of the Inquisition more than a million of them were still in Spain.

Some of the more liberal Churchmen advised the King to deport them; but others contended that such a course would only spread the infection. The King should consider

— *not just the local problem*. It was his duty to act for the common good. He had a responsibility for the welfare of the world at large.

The Moriscos must *all* be killed.

In answer to the objection that there might be *one* true Christian among the lot, it was pointed out that any such victim would go immediately to Heaven so instead of inflicting an injustice it would really be doing him a favor.

But the final decision was mass-deportation.

The remaining Moriscos were driven from their homes and herded toward the ports. Beaten, robbed, murdered or dying of hunger and thirst along the way, few of them lived to reach Africa and, so far as is known, none were left alive in Spain.

The Spanish intellectuals burst into one great song of hope and joy triumphant. Spain had been cleansed. It had accepted the European ideology. Its people were now united in one common belief — *the belief that Authority controlled their lives and would henceforth be responsible for their welfare*.

## WORLD EMPIRE

The loss of another million persons was not decisive. Millions had died in Spain during its centuries of vigorous achievement, and millions were still living in Spain.

On the surface, things were better all the way round. Spain was no longer dependent on domestic industry. During the century following the fall of Granada it had become the center of a great empire.

The Conquistadors had crossed unknown oceans and seized sixty degrees of latitude and one-sixth of the earth's circumference. They had explored and conquered Cuba, the Caribbean Islands, Peru, Chile, New Granada, Venezuela, Central America, Mexico — sweeping northward to the Missouri River and west to the Golden Gate.



In the Pacific, Spaniards had taken possession of the Philippines. In Europe, they had Portugal and the Low Countries and almost the whole of France. The King of France was a prisoner in Madrid. Spain now held the Balearic Islands and most of Northern Africa. By inheritance and conquest, they controlled Sicily, Sardinia, Naples, Milan, and the Germanies.

In the center of Europe, the Spanish Monarch was Emperor of all these lands and people. In the West he dominated England, which was under the rule of his daughter-in-law. In the East his troops had met the Turks at Vienna and flung them back into the Balkans, defeated.

In its final burst of glory, Spain had built the first great world empire – *an empire that all but encircled the globe.*

## HISTORY REPEATS

But there was a weakness at the core. Not only had the energetic Moriscos been exterminated, but for three generations the most self-reliant of Spain's young men had left their native land to seek fame and fortune in the New World. Others had gone to the European wars.

The people on the home front had been won over to the alluring theory of authoritarian control. They were losing their self-reliance along with their independence.

As in the case of Greece and Rome it was the beginning of the end.\*

Three generations – from grandfather to grandson – and the concept of individual freedom was all but forgotten.

---

\* In social and economic phenomena, affecting either the *growth* or the *disintegration* of a State, there is usually a long drawn out time interval between *cause* and *effect*. It has its parallel in the "shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves" adage. But when the facts are available the starting point can be traced back to the time when things were done that tended to *improve* or *impair* the effective use of human energy.

**I**N THE MEANTIME, while Spain had been busy strengthening its central government and extending its planned economy, England was drifting in the opposite direction.

Under the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the British Government became so badly disorganized and so weak that the people were being thrown on their own resources. It was "root hog or die" and private citizens rose to the occasion – with telling effect.

Unwittingly, without conscious intent, and with no centralized planning, the foundation was being laid for a new empire based on trade and commerce.

In the eyes of the European powers England had gone to pot. But when the invincible Spanish Armada sailed forth to capture the island, Francis Drake and his hastily assembled fleet of motley privateers gave them a licking.

*It was a turning point in world history  
and Spain never quite recovered.*

#### AFTERMATH

The days of the Conquistadors were over. Spanish colonies were beginning to stagnate under bureaucratic controls administered from faraway Madrid. The stream of riches that had been pouring in from the New World was slowing down. Domestic Industry had almost ceased to exist. Government overhead was completely out of bounds.

Things went from bad to worse and after two more generations the people of Spain were not getting enough food to keep themselves alive.

Unpaid soldiers left the frontiers unguarded and ravaged the countryside.

Vast areas of fertile land were abandoned and the rural population flocked to the cities in search of food – as though a fisherman might seek dry land in a frantic effort to change his luck! (Always, when people get into the habit of depending on centralized Authority to provide the things

which *they alone can produce*, mob psychology takes hold and they flock to the cities !)

## DESPERATION

The government could no longer get even a dribble of taxes from provinces which had formerly filled the Royal Treasury to overflowing.

Tax collectors tore down private homes and sold the materials to raise money. In some towns they demolished more than half the dwellings.

The King, in sheer desperation, slashed official salaries – even to the highest nobles, including members of the Royal household. Then he slashed them again – down a full two-thirds, but couldn't meet his payroll – even at the reduced rates !

The day of reckoning was at hand.

For too long the people had been lulled into false complacency. For too long they had been taught to look to centralized Authority to run their lives and provide for their needs.

Human energy had ceased to function. Spain, as a great power, had ceased to exist.

*But across the Ocean Sea, a new civilization was in the making – a civilization more closely resembling that of the Saracens than anything that had gone before.*

## Third Attempt

### *The Americans*

ABRAHAM AND THE PROPHETS knew that men are free. Christ knew it. The Saracens knew it. And two hundred years after the fall of Granada, the idea was gaining momentum along the eastern edge of North America.

Obscure individuals who lived and died unknown to anyone but their neighbors – men and women whose names have been lost to history . . . . *it was they who started the third attempt to establish conditions in which human beings could use their natural freedom.*

## CHAPTER 12

# The Early Beginnings



*The third revolutionary effort has hardly begun. Men are living to-day whose grandfathers helped to begin it. Yet it was started when Gods in human form were believed to govern most of the earth's population, and when Kings by Divine Right owned continental Europe and most of the New World.*

Along the Atlantic coast from Labrador to New Spain (the Floridas), less than three million persons lived in scattered settlements.

They were of all races, colors, ancestries and creeds. French were in the north and in the Carolinas. The Dutch had built a village on Manhattan Island, and their frontier cabins extended into the Mohawk Indian country of what is now Upper New York State. Germans had settled in the Jerseys and in the far west — even beyond Philadelphia. Swedes were in Delaware, Germans and Scotch-Irish were climbing the Carolina mountains. Massachusetts, the New Hampshire Grants, Connecticut and Virginia had been settled by English, French, Dutch and Irish.

Mingled with all these were Italians, Portuguese, Finns, Arabs, Armenians, Russians, Greeks, and Negroes from dozens of different African tribes and cultures. Black,

brown, yellow and white. Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, Protestants, Jews. Aristocrats, freemen, bound servants, slaves – and from all groups and classes there was inter-marriage with American Indians.

In the interest of historical perspective, it is important to remember that more than half of our history, in what is now the United States, was during the period when it was a conglomeration of colonial settlements – subservient to European powers – without any government of its own.

### THE SPANISH

The Old World monarchs, eager to extend their domains into the New World, granted large tracts of land to favored subjects.

Spain had the edge by almost a hundred years and began setting up colonies on the American mainland as early as 1509. In the beginning the efforts were rather loosely organized. The conquistadors were going ahead on their own initiative – handling any problems that arose and settling them right on the spot. Things were moving too fast for the Madrid bureaucrats to keep up with the details.

But as time went on the home office supervision was tightened up. Bureaucratic controls were extended to the utmost outposts and strictly administered for the common good.

Under the sponsorship of the government, and at the government's expense, carefully selected peasants of good character, sound morals and industrious habits were shipped over and set up on collectivist farms. The government provided detailed instructions for clearing the land, caring for the fences and the gates, and plowing and planting, cultivating, harvesting, and dividing the crops.

By order of the King, each settler's family was given a six months old pig, a barrel of grain for each adult and a hoe to every child over six years of age.

Each village was built as in Spain, a compact mass of cottages, protected by a detachment of soldiers and a well constructed fort.\*

In every settlement, a Commandant appointed by the King, kept order and dispensed justice, usually with much human sympathy and wisdom. Typically, he addressed the settlers as “my children,” and they were obedient, well-behaved, and gay. They made friends with the Indians and learned their ball games, raced horses, fought cocks, and danced and sang. They were cared for as well or better than their friends and relatives back home. Shipping was well organized, communication was fairly frequent. The Spanish colonists enjoyed a reasonable degree of safety and leisure in the American wilderness – and they usually had enough to eat.

## THE FRENCH

Along the same pattern, in later years the Kings of France established snug little settlements along the St. Lawrence River – then around the Great Lakes, down the Mississippi Valley to New Orleans and Mobile – then up the Ohio to Fort Duquesne (Pittsburgh).

In common with the Spanish, the French came over under well worked out programs designed to extend their homeland conditions into the New World.

Before Thomas Jefferson was born, there was a charming little Versailles in central Illinois. Aristocratic ladies

---

\* Through an unfortunate error made in Madrid, the Spanish Government ordered the fort at St. Louis to be built on a site which the Missouri River flooded every spring. Even the children knew that the river's battering ice would destroy the fort, *but orders are orders and must be obeyed*. The fort was built; the morose Commandant drank himself into a stupor every day that winter. In the spring the river demolished the fort, and St. Louis was unprotected when the British attacked it. Disaster seemed certain until a trader took command and under his voluntary leadership the settlers put up a good fight and saved the town.

and gentlemen – perfumed and jeweled, bewigged, powdered and patched – were carried by slaves in satin-lined sedan chairs to Twelfth Night balls, while happy villagers, fatter than any in Europe, crowded outside the windows to watch the gaiety.

### THE ENGLISH

The English settlers were among the late arrivals and in contrast to the Spanish, French and Dutch they did not come under government sponsorship.

Britain was too busy with domestic affairs and European conflicts. Getting a foothold in the New World was merely an incident, and in the beginning things were left very largely to the gentlemen adventurers and sea-faring buccaneers who were willing to spend their own money and take their own chances – with a nominal share of the profits going to the Crown.

In the eyes of the carefully selected and well-regimented French and Spanish, the English colonists were a scandal. Their villages were unplanned. Their houses were scattered and far apart, *instead of being built in orderly clusters, according to the standard European pattern.*

There was no coordination. They didn't cultivate their land communally. Their harvests were not shared equally. They had little respect for constituted authority.

As a result of internal dissensions and clashing of views, the English colonies were often split up. Rebels would pull out, push farther inland and start new settlements. All in all they were wild, undisciplined subjects of bad rulers – and to the Spanish and the French the word “Bostonian” came to mean a lawless, devil-may-care sort of person – quite the opposite of what it means today.

But let's start at the beginning and make a quick review of how the English colonies got their start:

One of the earliest efforts came as a result of a deal with the court favorite, Sir Walter Raleigh. For one-fifth of all



the precious metals that might be found, Raleigh was granted the rights to the vast Atlantic seaboard region which he named Virginia in honor of his Queen. (It's interesting to note in passing that the financial arrangement was just the reverse of the policy that had been followed by Ferdinand and Isabella. Columbus, who was financed by the Spanish Government, was to get only 10% – whereas Raleigh, who financed his own expeditions, would get 80%.)

Raleigh made two unsuccessful attempts to establish a settlement on Roanoke Island off the coast of North Carolina. After a brief stay the first settlers insisted on being taken back to England.

The next group was left stranded for almost three years and when the supply ship finally arrived the settlers had vanished.

Just what happened to them is still a mystery but many legends have grown up. Even today, among the Carolina foothills and westward as far as the Osage Mountains of Oklahoma, you can find rugged individuals who swear that their ancestors were in Raleigh's "lost colony," and that they simply moved to the mainland and up into the mountains.

After this disastrous experience, the English seem to have lost their enthusiasm. There were some reconnoitering voyages but it was not until the early 17th century that any further colonization efforts were attempted.

**F**OLLOWING IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF ELIZABETH, the religious (and profit-minded) James I continued the practice of extending special privileges and land grants to private interests.

A few gentlemen, getting a colonization permit through political pull, and agreeing to share their profits with the Crown, would organize a trading company at their own expense.

Their agents would collect a shipload of ne'er-do-wells and make an agreement with them which was usually broken by both sides.

As human material, the early English settlers were nothing to brag about. Successful men do not ordinarily bind themselves into servitude and leave home to vanish in a remote wilderness.

There were noteworthy exceptions which will be mentioned a little later, but for the moment we are talking about the early beginnings as emphasizing the difference between the English Colonies and the carefully planned settlements of other countries.

It is no exaggeration to say that, in the main, the people sent over by the early trading companies were the rag-tag-and-bob-tail of Europe – hungry wretches, lucky to be out of debtors' prisons, vagrants from highways and slums. They came at their own risk and with no guarantee of security.

Some of them were shanghaied, others sold themselves into slavery to pay for their passage. And there were shiploads of women who were auctioned off at the ports to settlers in need of wives.

The Spanish, French and Dutch came over to extend the power of their home governments but the English, more often than not, came to escape the domination of the Old World monarchs.

Among them were people in search of greater religious freedom, including the Pilgrims and the Friends who, back in England, were looked upon as the Holy Rollers and Jehovah's Witnesses of their time.

About the only aristocrats among the earlier settlers were younger sons, poor relations, and the black sheep of the European gentry, but they were in the minority and the American wilderness showed no favors.

The trading companies spent large sums to collect the

colonists and ship them across. Anticipating big profits, they promised to follow through with ample supplies. But voyages from England were infrequent. As often as not the supplies didn't arrive until a year later – along with a letter confidently demanding the first installment of profits.

The settlers couldn't depend on the trading companies and the trading companies couldn't depend on the settlers. They wouldn't work. They didn't send the expected furs, and the bound servants frequently skipped out to live with the Indians.

The gentlemen adventurers who had staked their fortunes were righteously indignant. Howling in increasing anguish for the *large profits* – or for *some profits* – or at least the *recovery of their cash outlay* – they finally wrote it off as a bad investment and the early trading companies went broke.

Thus, the colonists were left stranded between an empty sea and an unknown wilderness – *both totally indifferent to their fate.*

There were times when *even a gentleman* had to work – or starve. No one of the aristocratic class had ever faced such a choice. And those of the lower classes were in an even worse predicament. They had always depended on someone else to provide them with jobs. But on this side of the world jobs didn't exist. They had to *create their own jobs.* They had to use their *heads as well as their hands.* *It was either that or starve.*

They were up against a stern reality and no one could afford the illusion that anything other than his own will controlled his productive powers. Each came to realize that the *only* source of wealth is human energy attacking this earth – that he alone was responsible for his life – that if he didn't save it, then nothing would.

Thus, the slipshod practices of the early trading companies served to plant the seeds of self-reliance. From the

very beginning it was "*root-hog-or-die*," and in the desperate effort to survive they were learning how to wrest a pretty good living from the American wilderness.

Reports going back to England became a bit more favorable and some of the gentlemen adventurers who had managed to get permits, began to flirt with the idea of taking up residence in the New World.

As early as 1630 John Winthrop, of the Massachusetts Bay Company, moved to America along with the settlers who founded the town of Ipswich, Mass.

When King Charles heard about it he was quite shocked – particularly when he learned that Governor Winthrop had taken the charter along with him instead of leaving it safely deposited at the London headquarters.

From then on the absentee landlord proposition began to wane. The idea of winning fame and fortune in the New World had a strong appeal to some of the more adventurous men of means.

## CALVERTS

There was George Calvert (First Lord Baltimore) who was granted a patent to the Chesapeake Bay region, which after his death was colonized under the direction of his son.

The Calverts were Roman Catholic and, while their major aim was to make money, they were also interested in providing a refuge for others of their faith. There was considerable resentment on the part of the earlier colonists. They still harbored the Old World prejudices and didn't relish the idea of Catholics gaining a foothold in the New World.

But in spite of this, or perhaps *because* of this, the Calverts from first to last set an example of liberalism, religious tolerance, live and let live, which reflects itself even unto this day in the admirable traditions of the Maryland Free State.

YOUNG WILLIAM PENN was the son of a British admiral but he had turned Quaker, much to the disgust of his distinguished father. He was a rebel at heart and refused to remove his hat in the presence of the King, but managed to get a land grant in payment of a debt which the Crown owed his estate.

Accompanied by a hundred fellow-Quakers, Penn moved to America in the year 1682.

Again the reception was none too cordial. Pacifism had no place on the rugged frontier and the Quaker doctrines didn't jibe with those of the Puritans. But Penn also ran things on a liberal basis, with major emphasis on industry and thrift – rather than on religion.

Incidentally, he was America's first great advertiser. He deluged Europe with promotional material extolling the virtues of Pennsylvania, and offered special inducements to prospective settlers who were able to help finance themselves. But he held out no false promises of easy riches. First, last and always his emphasis was on *opportunity through hard work*.

It was Penn, perhaps more than anyone else, who started the influx of the great European middle classes – especially the sturdy and industrious Germans.

According to David Muzzey, "Penn was the greatest of the founders of American colonies. He had all the liberality of Roger Williams without his impatience, all the fervor of John Winthrop without his intolerance, and all the tact of Lord Baltimore with still greater industry and zeal."\*

The success of these early pioneers was doubtless responsible for attracting others from the aristocratic classes, and the English law of primogeniture was not without its

---

\* Quoted from "History of the American People" by David Saville Muzzey, published by Ginn & Company, New York, 1938.

influence. The eldest son inherited his father's estate and title. The younger sons were left to shift for themselves – and America was coming to be recognized as the land of opportunity.

## CAVALIERS

The migration to the New World was accelerated by the inquisitions of Cromwell, when the Cavaliers found it uncomfortable and even dangerous to remain in England.

They fled to America for reasons not dissimilar to those which, a century earlier, had prompted the young conquistadors to follow Cortez and Balboa.

Contrary to the general impression the word Cavalier is not synonymous with aristocracy. It was merely the name of the political party that supported Charles I, and it included many people of humble origin.

But the Cavaliers were temperamental, romantic individualists and they made an effective complement to the Puritans and Quakers.

Henry Woodfin Grady summed it up most admirably when “in the interest of preserving historical equilibrium” he reminded a New England audience that the Cavalier, as well as the Puritan, was among the early settlers, and that he was “up and able to be about.”\*

He pointed out that it was the Virginia Cavalier who first challenged France on this continent – that it was Cavalier John Smith who gave New England its very name, and was so pleased with the job that he's been handing *his own name* around ever since – and that while Miles Standish was cutting off men's ears for courting a girl without her parents' consent, and forbidding men to kiss their wives on the Sabbath Day, the intrepid Cavalier was courting and kissing everything in sight – and that the Almighty had vouchsafed great increase to the Cavalier colonies, the huts in the wilderness being as full as the nests in the woods.\*

I'd like to devote more space to the Virginia Cavalier but, again paraphrasing Henry Grady, we'll leave him to work out his own salvation, as he has always been able to do with an engaging gallantry and charm.\*

The main point is that from the very beginning America was the great melting pot. Neither Puritan, Cavalier nor Quaker long survived as such. But the virtues and traditions of each happily still live for the inspiration of their sons and the saving of the old fashion.\*

Although most of the Cavaliers settled in Virginia and Maryland, many of them migrated southward.

The Carolina region was successfully colonized in the 1650's by people moving down from Virginia and Pennsylvania. Specializing in turpentine and tar they got along splendidly until some twenty years later, at which time a carefully planned colonization effort was launched out of England.

A group of highly respected lords, aided and abetted by experts in statecraft, had been given a special charter which would make the Carolinas a separate colony.

It would be set up as a "grand model" of political structure, including all the complexities of European Feudalism – *plus a touch of Plato*. In fact it was so elaborate that the number of people required to carry out the theories would be almost as great as those left to do productive work.

The attempts to put the plan in effect resulted in chaos

---

\* These quotes and *near-quotes* are from "The New South" – a speech delivered before the New England Society in the city of New York, December 22, 1886, by Henry W. Grady, Journalist, Editor, Orator, Scholar, Ambassador of Good-will, Self-reliant Individualist and Southern Gentleman. He is not related to me but I was born just after his death and, like tens of thousands of others, I was given his name. Incidentally, "The New South" is well worth reading as bearing on the problems of today. You can find it in almost any public library. If not, drop me a line and I'll try to send you a copy, H.G.W., c/o Talbot Books, 6432 Cass Ave., Detroit 2, Michigan.

and dissension amounting to open rebellion, and progress was at a standstill until the early 1700's when the Lord Proprietors passed out of the picture and the Carolinas were set up as two separate colonies. From then on they were left pretty much in charge of their own affairs and they grew and prospered.

*But theoretical planners never seem to benefit from the lessons of history or from failures of their contemporaries. Barely had the Carolinas been restored to a reasonably practical basis of operation when an even more fantastic plan was launched for the last of the thirteen colonies.*

## ENIGMATIC EDWARD

The early story of Georgia is the story of just one man. His name was James Edward Oglethorpe and he was a most fascinating, intriguing, imaginative and lovable personality. Indeed it would put a strain on the thesaurus to find the adjectives that would do him full justice.

Handsome, curly haired, fastidiously clad, dashing, gallant, debonair, born to the aristocracy, a man of wealth, a fearless and distinguished soldier, an able strategist – and along with it all the most unselfish, generous and noble-minded person to play an important role in colonizing America.

Although head of Britain's most prosperous slave trading corporation, Oglethorpe was a humanitarian at heart. His heart was as big as all outdoors and the desire to do good by his fellow man overshadowed all of his other interests.

After a few years schooling at Oxford he served with the great soldier Prince Eugene in the war against the Turks, following which he returned to England and took over his ancestral estate on the banks of the winding river Wey.



A few years later he was elected to parliament and from then on devoted the best part of his life to a wide range of social reforms. He wanted to give the soldiers and sailors a better deal. He was worried about the price of coal. He wanted to provide refuge and relief for the persecuted Protestants of Europe. He spear-headed the agitation for English prison reforms – and fought to abolish the stupid law under which decent and industrious people could be thrown in jail for small debts.

A man of great energy and action, Oglethorpe worked day and night – making speeches, writing letters and publishing tracts at his own expense.

He also found time to keep himself posted on colonial affairs and was quite disturbed at the slipshod way in which the colonies were being run. England’s foothold on the American continent was none too secure. Unfriendly Spain was strongly entrenched in the south and the French were in the west and north. If England was to hold her own against encroachment there would have to be a better coordination of defensive strategy.

It was Oglethorpe’s interest in this latter problem which led to a most ingenious and appealing plan – a plan that would not only provide broad opportunities for social reform but would greatly strengthen the Empire from a military and economic standpoint.

His comprehensive proposal added up about as follows:

1. It was not only unjust but it was economically *wasteful* to keep people in prison for small debts. Why not set them up in the New World and at the same time provide a haven for the oppressed Protestants of Europe?
2. There was a vast area of desirable land lying between the Alatomaha and Savannah Rivers, south of the Carolinas and north of Spanish Florida.
3. Its latitudinal position corresponded to that of China, Persia, Palestine and the Madeiras – upon whom England was dependent for such important

- products as silk, hemp, wine, olive oil, spices and drugs.
4. With proper supervision such things could doubtless be produced in the proposed new colony – thus making England independent of foreign sources.
  5. By concentrating on such products the new colony would not in any way conflict with the activities of other colonies.
  6. From a military standpoint it would serve as a buffer between the Carolinas and Spanish Florida. To insure a strong army, special concessions would be made to soldiers – no one other than able-bodied fighting men would be permitted to own land.
  7. In the interest of the common good, everything would be beneficently administered under a well-balanced overall plan. This would not only provide for the necessities of military regimentation, but would eliminate the disorders, maladjustments and wastes of competition.
  8. The social aspects would also be carefully supervised. *Slaves, rum and Roman Catholics would be strictly prohibited.*
  9. The new colony would be named for King George II and it would be an honor and a credit to him – something to which he could point with pride as an example worthy of emulation by all the other colonies.
  10. First, last and always, Georgia would be a strictly eleemosynary proposition. To avoid dissension and insure adherence to the high objectives, no one would be allowed to vote. Oglethorpe would look after everything personally and his motto would be “Non Sibi, Sed Aliis” – (Not for Self, But for Others).

The comprehensive proposal was accepted without argument. Not only was the charter granted, but the English government departed from its usual policy and made a cash contribution of £10,000 to help get things started.

Oglethorpe put up some of his own money and, overwhelmed by his logic and persuasiveness, benevolent societies and right thinking citizens made liberal donations.

With his carefully selected band of settlers, Oglethorpe

came to the New World and founded the city of Savannah in the year 1733.

From a military standpoint the project was a success. With a handful of well trained troops Oglethorpe not only licked the invading Spaniards, but took advantage of the opportunity to extend the borders of Georgia considerably southward.

You can read about it in the history books and it's a most thrilling story.

But as I said before, the historians are inclined to stress the war aspects and overlook the lessons that might be learned as bearing on the problems of peace and progress.

In spite of his self-sacrifice and high motives, Oglethorpe's venture was a miserable failure from an economic and sociological standpoint.

He had failed to recognize that military regimentation always works at cross-purposes to creative progress – that human initiative doesn't operate according to the pattern of a beehive, and incidentally, he had overlooked the fact that variations in climate and soil are not wholly dependent on latitude – that regardless of the needs of man-made empires, the Almighty had never intended that Georgia should be a substitute for the Orient.

During 20 years of futile effort, the population never exceeded 6,000 and when it dwindled back down to around 500, Oglethorpe gave up in despair and returned to England.


A few years later all the bans and prohibitions were lifted. The pendulum swung the other way. Things were thrown wide open. "Refugees" who had fled to the Carolinas came back and brought their friends with them. And there was an influx of new blood from Virginia – including the Cavalier Talbots.

The last of the thirteen colonies grew by leaps and bounds. By the end of the century its population had passed the 160,000 mark!

*Oglethorpe's effort to set up a Utopia was one of the more extreme attempts at regimentation, but it is typical, in many respects, of the kinds of things that laid the groundwork for the revolution that was to come.*

## CHAPTER 13

# Roots of Revolution



*The American rebellion against economic tyranny really had its beginning in the 1660's – about forty years after the Pilgrims first set foot on New England's coast.*

It was during the period when England “was a piece of land entirely surrounded by smugglers” and ghouls were digging up London's dead to salvage the woolen shrouds. To improve the industry of his realm, Charles II had signed an act permitting the American colonists

to ship cotton, lumber, tobacco and other products to England – but *only* to England; *nowhere else*.

It was true that such produce was needed in England (much of it was already going there) but it was also true that the colonists needed sugar and molasses from the West Indies.

These early Americans were realists. They were fighting the earth and the sea for their lives – and incidentally laying the groundwork for a prosperous trade. The King's seal on a piece of parchment from faraway London didn't impress them, so they kept right on swapping their wool and tobacco for Cuban molasses.

Nothing much came of it. Charles II was a negligent ruler and he had other problems on his mind (see *Forever Amber*). True, his ships sank a few of the traders' ships but not one colonist was burned at the stake or even hanged.

Running the blockade became an ordinary business risk, and things went along smoothly for almost three-quarters of a century.

Then in 1733, the British Government announced a Five Year Plan, *to meet an emergency*.

The French Government was indirectly responsible. In the interest of price maintenance the French colonists had been prohibited from shipping food to France. As a result, there was over-production in the West Indies, and the desperate islanders were ready to sell their products for anything they could get.

The British Government, to protect its subjects against competition from such low-priced food, ordered the Colonists to stop trading with the French West Indies.

But the Americans had different ideas. Traffic in molasses, sugar and rum had become the backbone of their business. Prosperity depended on West Indies trade. To cut it off would mean a serious depression – and why shouldn't they take advantage of the lower prices?

American business men decided that it was time to have a showdown. They were trying to build a new country and it was a tough enough job – *even without such artificial interference with the natural and normal flow of trade*.

They tried to explain the facts back in London and after two years of "careful consideration" the British Government soothingly replied that it was *only an emergency measure*. It may hurt a little right now but after another three years the law will automatically expire and everyone will be better off.

But the colonists didn't quite see it that way and many who had never broken a law, took occasion to indulge in a little *temporary smuggling*.

At the end of the five year period it seems that the emergency wasn't quite over, so the British Government renewed the Molasses Act – again assuring the colonists that

it was only a temporary measure – *just an extension of the five year plan for another five years.*

By this time conditions in America paralleled the prohibition era of the 1920's. People were losing respect for legal authority. The law was a joke and everyone enjoyed breaking it. Each home had its contraband jug of molasses, its sugar loaf, its rum toddies, its rum tea and its buttered rum.

In and out of the ports and along the coast and across the Caribbean, the agile trading ships showed their heels to His Majesty's Navy – or, when cornered, they stood and fought – cheered on by the folks back home.

Trade was on the boom. Visitors from Europe marveled at the prosperity. And in 1748 the reliable British Government (still coping with the temporary emergency) renewed the Molasses Act, and business went on as usual for another full five years.

Off and on for almost a century, running the blockade had been just one of the ordinary risks of doing business. Of course the King's gunners added to the overhead and kept prices a bit higher than they should have been, but that was all and America continued to grow and prosper.

**B**Y THIS TIME the British colonies were almost as old as the United States are now. They were no longer frontier settlements. *Four generations of self-reliant settlers had made towns and farms more productive than any in Europe.*

Ben Franklin, the self-educated young radical from Boston, had moved to Philadelphia and was building up his own printing business from scratch. George Washington, in his teens, was carrying a musket and keeping a sharp lookout for Indians while he earned his living as a surveyor in the Virginia wilderness. Patrick Henry, after going broke, first as a storekeeper, then as a farmer, had now taken up the study of law.

Along the Mississippi, the Ohio, the James, the Delaware and the Hudson, such men read Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu and Locke. But among the uncultured farmers, sailors, hunters and trappers, reading was limited to almanacs, small-town papers and more than anything else, *the Bible*.

Most of the colonists remembered grandfathers and even fathers, who had risked their lives to read the Bible. They knew of men burned at the stake, wrenched joint from joint on the rack, broken on the wheel, for saying – or even being accused of saying – that ordinary men had a *right* to read the Bible. They had heard old people talk of the stealthy meetings at night, to hear the Bible read in secret by the light of one shaded candle – the alarm, the terror, the frantic escapes. They'd been told of meetings back on the open moors of Scotland, where people gathered to recite the Scriptures, under a moonless sky – of the sudden halloo, the charging horses, and the frantic running before the galloping troopers, riding down men and women, slashing them with swords. Then the long hiding while the troopers searched craftily, and wives of slain husbands lay under water in the ditches, praying to God that the baby would not whimper and that the hunt might end before the dawn.

The children of such people were happy to be in a land where they could fearlessly read their Bibles.

And they read about adventures and crimes, of hair-breadth escapes, of wars and spies, of political intrigues, of shepherds and vineyards and business deals, and of young lovers and family life.

And when they read the words of Abraham, Moses, Christ and all the prophets, saying that men are self-controlling and responsible, it checked with their experiences and they knew it was true.

They could have told similar stories out of their own lives – if the words had only come to mind.



THE COLONISTS had never believed in the ancient pagan gods and few of them had even heard of the modern pagan gods – which were then being created by the Old World intellectuals.

The age of science was dawning. It could no longer be denied that the earth is round and spinning in space. Intrepid individualists were prying into the secrets of nature. Galvani had captured something tingling in a jar. Ben Franklin had pulled the same sort of thing out of the sky on a kite string – and proved that it was lightning.

The Old World philosophers recovered from the shock of these new ideas – *but without giving up their pagan superstitions.*

They concluded that there is no God – then proceeded with great ingenuity to make a god of science.

They recognized natural law but they narrowed its meaning to exclude the possibility of progress. They explained that everything is controlled by physical force. Man's emotions, sentiments, imagination and creative urge have no place in the picture.

*The universe is a giant mechanism. Its wheels revolve forever. Everything is foreordained. There is no will. There is no high spiritual purpose – no Divine Plan. Nothing is created. There is no Creator.*

Man is unimportant, they said. As an individual, he counts for naught. He is but an insignificant animal among many species of animals – which are no more than dust on the cogs of the giant mechanism.

“But,” you may well ask, “*what controls the controls?*”

The answer is *Natural Law*. At least that was the answer of the French intellectuals, who were leading the people of Europe back to the era of pre-Christian thought.

Natural Law, they said, controls everything including man – except that Civilization has somehow got the upper

hand. Civilization is an UNnatural control. Civilization causes all human miseries. And since Religion is the basis of civilization, science must make war against Religion and Religion must be destroyed.

After the evils of Civilization and Religion are wiped out, then an enlightened despot will establish the Age of Reason based on Natural Law. Then after that has been accomplished, the enlightened despot will "*wither away*" and Natural Man, at last living naturally, will be good and happy ever after.

That, as nearly as I can understand, is what the great European intellectuals seemed to believe. *And they lived off the aristocrats while writing their books and plays designed to destroy the aristocracy and thus clear the way for the enlightened despot who would run things according to their learned theories.*

It seems that most of them were betting on Prussia's Frederick the Great, who was responsible for the Seven Years War, which according to his boastful claim, he had started "*on a whim.*"

Frederick was an ardent atheist and an able schemer. He greatly admired the French Intellectuals who were favored guests at his court. Their theories fitted in with his dreams for a new world Empire — *with Frederick of course, as the enlightened despot!*

### 1755 — 1763

England was now under the rule of her second German King and as an ally of Prussia, she had turned her guns on France.

Quaintly enough, the colonists called it the French and *Indian War.*

On this side of the Atlantic both governments were seeking allies among the Indians. Both sides bribed them with fire-water. Both sides armed them with weapons. Both sides paid liberally for scalps.

So the Red Men set fire to the White Men's cabins. Settlers on both sides were scalped or burned at the stake. Their wives were taken as squaws and their children grew up as Indians.

The Old World quarrels had extended to the NEW. Along the outlying frontiers things were very bad. And along the Atlantic coast business was at a standstill.

### BRIGHT IDEA

But self-preservation is the first law of nature. People must eat; trade must go on.

Out of the war itself, the resourceful colonists devised a peaceful way of doing business and it was a bright idea:

*Governments at war have prisoners to exchange. Why couldn't traders exchange the prisoners?*

So they bribed the British and French officials and got permits to sail the seas and exchange the prisoners.

As long as the great powers continued to fight, business men on both sides carried on a prosperous trade with each other. Their ships no longer ran from their Governments' Navies. The captain merely stood to, waited for the King's officers to come aboard, and met them with a smile – *and a permit.*

A lively business in these permits developed at every port. They were sold at public auction. Prices depended on supply and demand, and speculators on the sidelines played the permit-market.

Trading was peaceful and business was on the boom until the war came to an end in 1763.

There were no more prisoners to exchange but the Molasses Act was again renewed "*as an emergency measure*" – and the American traders put their guns back on their ships and set about to readjust their activities to a peacetime basis.

**B**UT BACK IN LONDON the British Government was undergoing a change. George II had died in the middle of the war and his grandson had come to the throne in 1760.

George William Frederick was the third of the Hanoverian line of rulers who had been brought over from Germany in 1714, after the House of Stuarts had run its course.

The first two Georges had taken things rather easy. They hadn't even bothered to learn the English language and had depended largely on their ministers to run things.

With George III it was going to be different.

He was only 22 years old when he came to the throne, but he was a hard worker and a stickler for detail. For the first time in generations England had a conscientious King. In common with his cousin Frederick the Great, young George was an ardent admirer of the European intellectuals who were still looking for an enlightened despot to put their theories in effect.

Frederick the Great was losing interest. He was too busy with domestic affairs to worry about a world empire, *and rumor had it that he was becoming a bit too tolerant towards the Christian religion.*

George III looked like the next best bet.

Time and circumstances offered big opportunities for the new King. England had been too loosely governed. The planning had been inadequate. For too long its colonists had been flouting the authority of the Crown. Something must be done and George III was the man to do it.

Spurred on by an ambitious mother, he would bring to the English people the benefits of law and order – with systematic regimentation in the best Prussian manner.

**A**S SOON AS THE WAR WAS OVER, the young monarch rose to the occasion and earnestly set about the job of working out every detail affecting the lives of his subjects – both at home and abroad.

And truly no Living Authority could have ever planned an economy with greater thoroughness.

Aided and abetted by his statisticians he became alarmed at the growth of the colonies which, according to the charts, threatened to totally depopulate the British Isles and make a ghost town out of London, within another 50 years.

George III took immediate action to prevent the impending catastrophe. First, he restricted emigration to the colonies. Then to further retard their expansion he prohibited any more settlers from moving westward. In the interest of protecting the future of the fur trade, the area from the Alleghenies to the Mississippi was forever reserved for the Indians.\*

But given the facts as they were at the time, nobody could have planned an economy more wisely than young King George. With his brain trust at his elbow and with the welfare of his subjects always uppermost, he balanced everything most admirably.

Agriculture was in the colonies, industry in England; he set about to regulate both, and provided British shipping with the triangular voyage between England, the American ports, and the West Indies.

The home office planning was extended to include even the American trees. The King's men went through the forests, marking the best pines to be held in reserve for his Royal Navy.

This thoughtful prudence so irritated the colonists that they went out of their way to use these pines for themselves. Then, adding insult to injury, they adopted the pine tree as their symbol of liberty, and in later years, displayed it on

\*

---

It is interesting to note that the pioneer fur-traders in their greatest days never got from the Mississippi valley more than a sixth of the valuable furs that it now produces - with St. Louis as the leading center of the world's fur trade.

flags flying from the masts of American fighting ships through the first war for the Revolution.

It is unfair to place too much blame on George III. He did everything conscientiously and in the interest of what he conceived to be the common good. But down through the years the colonists had grown tired of being the pawns of Old World bureaucracy. They were fed up with all the rules and red tape that interfered with the normal, natural job of applying their energies to the production of goods and services. Things had reached a point where they had lost all sense of distinction between good laws and bad laws.

Europeans couldn't understand. Why, for instance, should the colonists object to the Stamp Tax? A small, suitable tax upon every legal document should not be a burden to anyone.

But the colonists refused to pay and the law was repealed.

And who could explain the Boston Tea Party? There had been an overproduction of tea. The East India Trading Company needed protection. If something were not done the price of tea would fall and the tea growers of India would be in for a depression.

To prevent the disaster, the British Government might have burned the surplus, just as the Brazilian Government lately burned coffee and just as our own Brain Trusters ordered the killing of little pigs. But King George was more sensible. He had the tea shipped to the American colonies at a controlled price – a little less than they had been paying, a little more than a free market would have supported.\*

And did the colonists applaud this wise measure for the good of all? *They did not.* Quite the contrary, they raided the ship and threw the tea into Boston Harbor.

---

\*

It is the invariable policy of all economic regulations by all States to prevent a fall in prices, at any cost. Actually, of course, lower prices increase consumption, and production, and trade, and jobs.

This act of violence and wilful destruction of property was immediately condemned by leading patriots – including Benjamin Franklin and John Adams.

The incident would doubtless have been smoothed over except that King George and his bureaucrats unwittingly came to the aid of the rioters:

The port of Boston was ordered closed to all outside commerce. The Massachusetts charter was revoked. One of the King's military henchmen was appointed governor with sweeping administrative powers. Town meetings were prohibited. Persons accused of crime in resisting law enforcement were to be deported to England for trial. Last, but not least, and the thing that was most irritating to the Puritans, the boundaries of the province of Quebec were extended to include everything north of the Ohio River.

**T**HE BOSTON TEA PARTY is usually thought of as the beginning of the American Revolution but for more than a century the colonists had been rebelling against the tyranny of Old World monarchs.

From the early 1660's down to the time when Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, they had continuously revolted against just one thing: *Authority pretending to control the initiative and creative energy of human beings.*

Five hundred men had come out of the frontier cabins in Virginia to oust the Royal Governor who protected the graft-paying sale of guns and whiskey to the Indians.

In the Carolinas, in Pennsylvania, in Connecticut, in Massachusetts, in the New Hampshire Grants, and on the high seas – their rebellion had been continuous and increasing. And now, at last the British Government was compelled to use the only power that any state has at its disposal – *the power of brute force used with general consent.*

But when the King's troops were moved into Boston to take things over, the Americans did not consent. They stood their ground as free individuals and fought the British Regulars.

#### WITHOUT A LEADER

The great fact in history is this: *The American Revolution had no leader.*

This fact is the hope of the world because human freedom is a personal matter. Only the individual can protect human rights in the infinite complexity of men's relationships with each other.

Nothing on earth is more valuable than the person who knows that all men are free and who accepts the responsibilities that go with freedom.

The pioneer Americans knew that they were free. They had learned it the hard way – from stern experience.

*So when the British Government tried to regiment them and obstruct their efforts they simply ignored it. When the King laid down silly restrictions and controls on trade the colonists went right on trading. When the weaving of cloth was prohibited to protect weavers in England, the women of America kept right on working at their looms.*



## CHAPTER 14

# The Unknown Individual



*The war for American Independence was begun by the individual. He was asleep in his bed when someone pounded on his door and shouted out in the night, "The troops are coming."*

But what could he do? He was only one man against the armed might of Britain. If he had been a King, a Czar or a Potentate – then he could have solved vast problems and done great things; he could have brought the Powers of Europe together in

harmony and made an everlasting peace and prosperity around the world.

But he was not a King, not a Royal Governor, not a rich man, not an important man. He was *just one little man* – unknown to anyone outside his own neighborhood. So what could he do?

Why should he take the initiative? Such things usually cleared up – they always had. So why not let nature take its course? This was no time to be foolhardy. One should keep calm, use his head, and consider the practical aspects. And he had his family to think of. What would become of them?

Most men felt that way. They knew they could do nothing and they had better sense than to try. That night in Lexington many of them stayed in bed.

But the unknown individual chose in his own mind between submission that looked like safety – and rebellion that seemed utterly hopeless. Many respected citizens were against him; the teachers, the writers of books, were against him. Men in high places – many widely known men, stood staunchly with the King.

But the unknown individual had the courage of his convictions. He got up. He put on his clothes and took his gun and went out to meet the British troops. Not acting under orders, not led nor wanting to be the leader, he stood on his own feet, a responsible, self-controlling person, and fired the shot heard round the world.

*The sound of that shot said that man  
is a free agent – that government is  
the servant rather than the master.*

#### EBENEZER FOX

The records are scant. The unknown man had no biographer. He was just a plain, ordinary person who had learned from his own experience that each human being is self-controlling – responsible for his own acts and for his relations to others.

Ebenezer Fox was such a man and he typifies thousands of Americans of his time. Ebenezer helped fight the War of Independence as an ordinary seaman under the Pine Tree Flag, and in the early 1800's he wrote down his "simple narrative" for his grandchildren because, he said, they liked to hear him tell it.

He was born in the East Parish of Roxbury, Massachusetts in January 1763. His father was a tailor – a poor man with a large family, so Ebenezer at the age of seven was signed over to a farmer named Pelham. (This was not unusual. Back in those days most families expected a boy of seven to be self-supporting – either at home or as a servant to someone else. It sounds a bit shocking but, as Mrs. Lane points out, the same thinking still prevails in eastern Europe

and western Asia. Even in these United States, as late as the 1860's, the age of self-support was only nine).

Suffering many hardships and privations, Ebenezer frequently complained to his father – but the elder Fox paid no attention to his son's grievances. He assumed that they arose merely from a spirit of discontent and would soon subside.

In the meantime, Ebenezer was hearing considerable talk regarding the tyranny of government and “expressions of exasperated feeling against Great Britain . . . from the mouths of all.”

He pondered over the things he heard and began to apply them to his own circumstances.

“I thought that I was doing myself great injustice by remaining in bondage, when I ought to go free; and that the time was come when I should liberate myself and . . . *do what was right in my own eyes.*”

So, at the age of 12, Ebenezer ran away from his master and got a job on a ship to Santo Domingo. Returning with a contraband cargo of molasses and coffee, the ship was attacked by two British gunboats off Stonington, Connecticut. Young Ebenezer jumped overboard, stripped off his clothes in the water, swam to shore under fire from the British guns and barely escaped drowning.

Thus he returned from his first voyage, penniless and stark naked, “without injury, but nearly exhausted from fatigue and fear, not a little augmented by the sound of the bullets that whizzed around my head while in the water . . . My appearance (among the rest of the crew on shore) in a state of entire nakedness excited not a little mirth . . . But after a few jokes at my expense, the mate took off one of the two shirts with which he had taken the precaution to provide himself before he left the vessel, and gave it to me.”

Having not a penny, no food, and only this shirt to his back, Ebenezer “sought another job diligently and had the

good fortune to get one" – again on a smuggler's ship – again bound for Santo Domingo.

A little later Ebenezer Fox volunteered to fight for independence. He was wounded, captured, starved on the British "hell-ship" in Long Island Sound; but he escaped and re-enlisted.

He became a gunner which cost him the hearing of one ear, but he fought through to the end and when the war was over and the American ships had no further need for gunners, Ebenezer, along with other members of his crew, was left stranded in France, and had to work his way home as best he could.

Back in those days there were no veterans' benefits. Ebenezer's wages for five years of hard fighting were his share of the prize-money paid for a captured British ship. The money turned out to be quite worthless because, as he says, it was paid "in the paper currency of the time." \*

*Such men began and won the war for independence. For ten years they had been storming British forts; they came out of their homes and fought at Lexington. In June they stood against wave after wave of British troops at the Battle of Bunker Hill – but it was not until the following February when that historic hilltop was white with snow – it was not until then that they had a leader.*

## AMERICA'S GODFATHER

His name was Thomas Paine. He was a workman, poor and growing old. Son of an English corset-maker, he spent most of his childhood helping at his father's trade. But he had managed to get a few years schooling and had learned to read and write, which was a rare privilege for a working-

\*

---

"The Revolutionary Adventures of Ebenezer Fox of Roxbury, Massachusetts," printed in Boston, 1838.

class boy. He married a tobacconist's daughter. They inherited her father's tiny shop in Lewes, England. His wife died. The little shop was sold for debt. After struggling along at various jobs until he was nearly forty, friends lent him money to pay his passage to America.

Benjamin Franklin gave him a letter to a Philadelphia printer, who hired him at \$5 a month to start a little magazine, called *The Pennsylvanian*.

That was in the year 1775. The colonies were blockaded and could get no gunpowder. The new editor launched the first copy of *The Pennsylvanian* with a recipe for home-made gunpowder. It was a sensational success, and Americans mixing the ingredients in their kitchens, may have noticed the name of the editor – a name, then obscure, but which was to resound down through history.

Thomas Paine was saving his money to print a little pamphlet covering his views on freedom.

He had taken up writing at middle age and in contrast to the pompous style of the 18th century writers, he avoided quoting the classics and wrote in the simple language of the people.

The pamphlet bore the title "*Common Sense*." It came off the press early in 1776 and in all the history of printing there has never been such a spontaneous sale. It was not copyrighted. There were no copyright laws and anyway Paine wanted no profit for his political writings. The first edition didn't even bear his name. It was widely reprinted and it has been estimated that out of a population of 3,000,000 people more than 300,000 bought copies. Translated into present day terms that would correspond to a sale of around 14,000,000.

All who could read, read it. Others listened while it was read to them. It said to Americans: Do what is right in your own eyes. Cut loose from England. Set up a government of your own. "There hath not been such an opportunity since

the time of Adam. We have it in our power to make a New World.”

Shortly thereafter, Paine enlisted as a private in the defeated, retreating army, falling back before the British advance, from Long Island to Manhattan, across Jersey, across the Delaware, across Pennsylvania, and when Congress had taken to its heels and soldiers were deserting and cautious men were hastening to proclaim their loyalty to the King – it was then that Thomas Paine, by the light of a campfire, spread a scrap of paper on a drumhead and wrote:

*“These are the times that try men’s souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. What we obtain too cheap we esteem too lightly. It would be strange indeed, if so celestial an article as FREEDOM should not be highly rated.”*

His ringing words cut through the gloom of defeat. Courage in every colony rose to meet the challenge, and Washington declared that Thomas Paine was worth more than an entire army.

To the whole world of his time, this plain spoken man was the leader and the spirit of the New Revolution. In America, England and France, he was the greatest political influence of his century.

## THE DECLARATION

More than a year after Bunker Hill, six months after Paine’s *Common Sense* had raised all the unheard voices into one loud roar for independence, an extraordinary meeting was held in Philadelphia.

It seems that Jefferson had asked Thomas Paine to help draw up a statement reviewing the causes of the war and including a simple declaration of the principle for which the people were fighting.

The tentative document was now ready and representatives from each of the colonies had come to the meeting to consider its adoption.

These were gentlemen of *solid responsibility and high social position*, including Franklin, John Adams, Richard Henry Lee, Charles Carroll, Robert Morris, John Hancock, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, and George Walton.

Such men had everything to gain by standing with the King. If they joined the rebels, they risked not only their lives but the lives of their families. Under English law their children and their children's children would be attainted traitors.

Each man in attendance had a landed estate, a substantial business, a professional position, or all three. He need only do nothing. By keeping quiet he might save his property, his superior class-status, and his life. (And he could easily justify his position on the grounds that, while he might not wholly agree with the Government's policies, a good subject's duty is to obey the laws and remain loyal to his King.)

Some of them refused to sign, and each who did, knew what he risked when he wrote his signature under the words, "*We pledge our lives.*" And life was what he was prepared to lose when he signed a declaration of that ten-year-old war – its cause and its motive:

***"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."***

## DUAL PROBLEM

The Philadelphia group were undertaking – not only to win the war – but to lay the groundwork for an entirely new kind of State.

They were assuming the leadership of the weak and losing side. The problems were many. First of all, money would

have to be raised and the military effort would have to be better organized. Scattered mobs could never defeat Great Britain.

The prospects were not bright. The King's troops were advancing down the Hudson. His fleet was approaching New York.

The leaders of the Revolution were faced with the armed might of the British Empire – with thirteen disorganized and quarreling colonies at their backs.

## DISSENSION

The different colonies had grown up as separate units. They were divided by religion, customs, economic interests and commercial rivalries. They would have to be brought together in a unified objective if the war were to be won. And winning the war would mean very little unless a political structure could be devised that would solve the kinds of problems that had brought on the war.

Many prominent citizens, land-holders, bankers, rich merchants and speculators, unmindful of the underlying causes of The Revolution, were looking forward to the time when America itself would be set up as a monarchy – independent of Europe but following the Old World pattern of a Living Authority.

Others were clamoring for an out-and-out Democracy, overlooking the fact that down through history all such attempts had led to tyranny and rebellion.

Each of the representatives at Philadelphia knew that men are free and yet there was a wide difference of viewpoint as to what form of political structure would *keep men free*.

The Declaration had abolished government, but this was *war*. The revolutionists must have authority to mobilize, arm, command and feed the troops, and taxes would have to be collected to pay the bills.



But any authority that they might exercise over any other man must be given to them by that man, so it was necessary to call for a general grant of authority from the people in the colonies.

Time and space would not permit all of them to meet at one place; they must meet in many places, and each group must send someone to represent all the individuals in that group.\*

From all the colonies, messengers on horseback went galloping through the woods to the secret meeting places to find out what was happening, to get instructions as to what should be done by the folks back home – and above all things to make sure that no one tried to set up any central government that would infringe on their rights.

Frequently the King's troops were at the meeting place ahead of the messengers, but amidst alarms, defeats and retreats, most of the delegates managed to get together.

## THE STATE CONSTITUTIONS

In their spare moments some of the delegates would take their quills in hand and write out substitutes for the Royal Charter under which their colony had been operating.

The State Constitutions were an outgrowth of these Royal Charters.

Each colony had had its own separate charter, but they were all based on the Old World belief that Authority controls the individual and that no person can do anything without its permission.

\* —————

The idea was not new. For generations past the colonists in their scattered and unprotected settlements had been getting together in times of danger – sending their representatives to get help – to bargain for it if necessary and make formal agreements with other colonies. So they were used to the idea of delegating to one man their natural right of free speech and free contract. These early beginnings ultimately led to the invention of a new and unique device called the *Convention of Delegates*.

So the State Constitutions would have to be just the reverse of the Royal Charters. They would have to define the uses of force that would and would *not* be *granted to public officials*. It was a matter of turning things upside down, and there was no precedent to serve as a guide.

Able men in every colony – and in frequent consultation with the representatives of other colonies – continued their efforts to develop State Constitutions that would be in harmony with the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence.

Over and over again the State Constitutions were rewritten and over and over again they were rejected by the people.

## RESISTANCE

For six long years, while the Revolution's leaders tried to evade the King's troops, and to hold the struggling army together, and to get food and shoes and powder and bullets from stupid politicians and grafters who stole the money and let the soldiers die, and while they negotiated loans from France and tried to get French help against the British – while they were doing all these things they were also trying to persuade Americans to agree to the Constitutions.

But the unknown Americans – *the Ebenezer Foxes* – were fighting Authority and each was determined to “*do what was right in his own eyes.*” They were resentful of anything that even resembled Authority and they did not intend to let a new power grow up as fast as they cut the old one down.

Grudgingly and most suspiciously, the colonies, one after another, finally agreed to their State Constitutions, but not until strict prohibitions against the misuse of force had been clearly set forth in each constitution.

## DILEMMA


Then the people of the different States couldn't make up their minds whether to *unite* or to become *separate nations*.

And if they were to unite in one strong government, what would happen to the freedom for which they were fighting? And there was strenuous argument between the big States and the small States as to how many votes they would be allowed, in case they did join up with the Union.

They realized that if they did *not* unite, their freedom would be endangered. Americans occupied only a small part of the New World. Most of the Western Hemisphere was still in the possession of Britain, France and Spain.

**The heterogeneous and scattered States, weakened under the strain of war, could hardly hope to survive *unless united under some kind of centralized government, strong enough to hold its own against the great powers of the world.***

## The New Model



During another six years of confusion and discouragement following the surrender of Cornwallis, while the leaders of the Revolution were negotiating the peace treaty and trying to hold the Continental Congress together, and to keep the States from fighting each other and to figure out a way to pay something on the French debt before the French army moved in to collect it – during this period when George Washington had less hope than at

*Valley Forge – the leaders of the Revolution made one last effort to form the independent States into a Union.*

With the State Constitutions as a guide they attempted to write an *overall constitution* that would combine them into a cooperative Federation, designed to work on the principles of individual freedom, liberty and law.

Common men were to run their own affairs. Each person was to have equal power so that he would be free to struggle for his own self-interest in arriving at a satisfactory balance in his relationships with other men.

### AGE-OLD PROBLEM

The problem was not new. It was as old as history but no one had ever found the answer. The Greeks had been unable to solve it. The Romans had been unable to solve it. Various experiments had been tried and all had failed.

No one had ever found the solution, but it is doubtful if

in the entire history of mankind so unusual a group had ever come together for so important a purpose.

Realistic frontiersmen, practical builders, jurists, statesmen, students of history, analysts of Old World government from the perspective of a New World in the making — their counterparts are rare in this modern age of specialization and the so-called "Progressive Education."\*

Democracy was not the answer. The word Democracy means rule *BY* the masses, and *mass rule* means *mob rule*.

As James Madison pointed out in the Federalist Papers: "A pure democracy can admit no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will be felt by a majority, and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party. Hence it is, that democracies have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have, in general, *been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.*"

Obviously there can be no individual freedom unless the rights of the minority can be protected, and in an unrestrained democracy it's too easy for the organized pressure groups to impose on the rights of others.

America was to be set up as a Republic — which means that the laws would be made and administered by representatives who, directly or indirectly, are chosen by the people to *protect the interests of ALL the people.*

The word *REPUBLIC* means rule *for* the people — and as

\*

---

To be fitted for public office in later life it was then considered necessary for a boy to be given the education of an English gentleman. Before he was 16 years old, the philosophy and the history of the entire European past had been pounded into his head. Thus, when he was old enough to begin thinking things out for himself, he had within his own mind a storehouse of knowledge covering thousands of years of human experiences. Also he was drilled in logic and the accurate meaning of words as essential to straight thinking and as a protection against the *fallacies of fancy rhetoric!*

(One of these days I hope to write a book or at least a pamphlet on the educational techniques that produced such men as Washington, Jefferson, Madison—with a special chapter on the Donald Robertson School.)

Isabel Paterson points out: “*It sets a limit to political power. [It] signifies an organization dealing with affairs that concern the public, thus implying that there are also private affairs – a sphere of social and personal life, with which the government is not and should not be concerned.*”

Of course in the last analysis any government, regardless of what it may be called, must be a man (or a small group of men) in power over many men.

That being the case, then how would it be possible to transfer the power of the ruler to each man in the multitude?

The answer is that *it is not possible.*

The only solution lay in the direction of *destroying power itself.* The only way that men could remain free and be left in control of their individual energies was to cut the power of government to an irreducible minimum.

But how could that be done without the danger of out-and-out anarchy?

The answer is quite simple – once it has been found, but never in all history had anyone thought it through.

## SOLUTION

The head of a state is a human being and in a human being thinking, deciding, acting and judging are inseparable. But in this new American republic no top official would ever be permitted to act as a whole human being. The functions of government would be cut into three parts:

1. One part was to *think* and *decide.* It would be called *the CONGRESS.*
2. Another part would be responsible for *getting action.* It would be headed by the Chief Executive – *the PRESIDENT.*
3. A third part was to serve as *judge* or *referee* – and would be known as *the SUPREME COURT.*

And over these three was set a written statement of political principles, to be the strongest check on them all. It was to be government by law, with clearly defined rules of the game – instead of government by *whim*. Thus, the Constitution was to serve as an impersonal restraint upon the fallible human beings who must be allowed to use these fragments of authority over the multitudes of free individuals.

The dangers of dictatorship must be avoided for all time to come. No one person or small group of persons should ever be able to get too much power and the minority (even down to the last individual citizen) would be protected against oppression by the majority or by any organized pressure groups.

Such were the objectives of the American Revolutionary Leaders, and for months they struggled to draw the blueprints for this new and completely different concept of political structure.

Then they went out and fought for two more years in an effort to get it accepted.

With arguments and speeches; with pamphlets, newspapers and books; with appeals to logic and justice and common sense and self-interest; with political deals – with every weapon they had, they fought the demand for monarchy and they fought the demand for democracy.

**T**HE WAR ENDED ON OCTOBER 19, 1781. Peace was formally ratified September 3, 1783, but the United States did not come into being until June 1788 at which time the Federal Constitution had been accepted by nine States – *but only on the condition that it be amended to include certain specific restrictions and reservations* that would protect the individual against the improper use of force and prevent the central government from encroaching on the rights of the State governments.

In effect the Ebenezer Foxes said to the Revolutionary Leaders:

“We don’t mind joining up in a voluntary Federation – with a limited organization to look after the overall problems.

“But we are not so much interested in the good things that you *could* do, as we are in the bad things that you or your successors *might* do if there were too much centralized power. It should be clearly understood, once and for all, that we don’t propose to drift back into the same sort of situation that brought on the war. *We want no European regimentation on this side of the world!*

“The whole idea is to protect the freedom of the individual citizen – not only from outsiders but from insiders, and especially from men in public office. All down the line as well as *up* the line it’s got to be *government by law instead of government by violence*. Things have got to be run according to definite rules of the game instead of by the whims and fancies of those whom we elect to office. There is no one person or small group of persons smart enough to run this country – even if we, the citizens, were smart enough to pick the best of the lot.

“The Federal government along with State governments, County governments and City governments must be set up as the servant rather than the master – and it’s got to be kept that way.

“It’s us that’ll have to put up the money and it’s us that’s writing the ticket.

“It’s your job to preserve law and order so that we can be free to get our work done. That’s why we are giving you a monopoly on the use of force. We are giving it voluntarily and it’s not to be used in a manner that will interfere with the constructive activities of free citizens.”

**T**HE FIRST 10 AMENDMENTS were the “price of ratification.” In addition to Freedom of Speech, Freedom of the Press, Religious Freedom and Right of Trial by Jury, public officials were forbidden to seize or to search a person or his property or his private papers – except under certain definite circumstances prescribed by written law.



Private property could not be taken for public use *without just compensation to its owner.*\*

Thus, the individual's life, liberty and property rights were to be held secure against unjust acts – not only on the part of other individuals – but against unjust acts on the part of the government itself.

Cruelty was outlawed once and for all, and any accused person was to be considered innocent until his guilt was proven.

And last, but not least, it became a part of constitutional law that any powers not *specifically granted* to the Federation automatically *remained in the hands of the separate States, or in the hands of the people themselves.*

These early amendments are known collectively as the *Bill of Rights* but the name is misleading and tends to confuse a careless mind.

The word "Rights" reflects the feudal concept. It is entirely accurate as used in England because the English Bill of Rights is a statement of certain freedoms which the British government *permits* its subjects.

But in America, it's exactly the opposite. Our *so-called* Bill of Rights is really a *statement of prohibitions* – defining the uses of force that *would or would not* be granted to public officials. It is based on the principle that human rights are *natural rights*, born in every human being along with his life, and *inseparable from his life*. People cannot be given that which already belongs to them – and *only to them*.

Here in America, men in public office would be the *recipi-*

\*

---

For the first time in history, the right to own property was to be given full legal recognition extending to the humblest citizen without reference to class distinction, social position or status of birth. The moral right of private ownership had long been recognized by the Christian Church as essential to spiritual freedom. But outside The Church the idea had gained little headway. As late as 1776, for example, no one in France could own even so much as a pigeon – unless he happened to be a person of "Royal Birth" – a king, a prince or a noble.

*ents* of permission – *not the donors*. They would be the servants of the people – not the masters.

That is what makes the American concept of constitutional government different from that of the British or anything else that had ever gone before.

The difference is the very essence – the very foundation of the Revolution. Ours is the only basic innovation in political structure since the beginning of recorded history.

That's an important point to remember – especially during these hectic times when the old world “isms,” after a bit of face-lifting and relabeling, are presented in glowing terms as something entirely new and ultra-modern. The safety, the freedom, the security, the very life of every American, and the future of his children depend on understanding the *real meaning* of the *real* Revolution.

The ten basic amendments were adopted in December 1791. The dreams of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton and Madison had become a reality.

From the Old World viewpoint, the Constitution had been too weak even before the amendments – *and now it had been made even weaker*. Europeans were aghast. They cried out that this new American Government would be short-lived and that it could come to no good end. The Americans had violated all the experience and wisdom that had been handed down through the ages. Older governments refused to recognize the new Federation of States. Nearer to anarchy than this, no government could come and still be a government.\*

---

\*

There were dissenters from the European viewpoint, including the English Statesman William Pitt who, after reading the American Constitution exclaimed: “It will be the wonder and admiration of all future generations.” And there was Count Aranda who, as Prime Minister of Spain, was trying to bolster its economic affairs and who sounded a note of warning to the Old World monarchies when he said, “This [American] Republic is born a pigmy. It has required the support of two such powerful States as France and Spain to obtain its independence but the time will come when it will be a colossus – *even to those countries.*”

Of course in the traditional sense of the term it was not a government. It was a reversal of all the pagan precedents. Instead of following in the footsteps of the Old World dictators and trying to solve the problem by setting up the *strongest possible government*, the Revolutionists had taken exactly the opposite course. Their aim was to make the central government just as *weak as possible* – throwing the responsibility back on the individual citizen – with the State Constitutions serving as buffers in between.

It must be admitted that the Old World skepticism was not without foundation.

Even with the strongest form of government the prospects were not bright for the new and sparsely settled States sprinkled along the Atlantic Coast between an inland wilderness and a sea dominated by Great Britain's Navy.

**Canada had remained loyal to the King. Spain still held the Floridas, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California. France owned most of the territory between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains. Russia was in the extreme northwest.**

## CHAPTER 16

# Unplanned Planning



The States had joined themselves into a voluntary federation but there was no unified control – *no overall plan*.

This was just the opposite of the Old World pattern. In other nations the overlords develop their ambitious plans to be enforced by the firing squad and supported by huge predatory armies. It looks fine on paper, but it is contradictory to the nature of human energy. It is always at the expense of individual

initiative and has always resulted in oppression – leading to human degradation and war.

In America the planning would be done on a *decentralized* or grassroots basis. It was a new experiment, under which free men would have the opportunity to live their lives, plan their own affairs and work with one another – not under the lash of coercive authority – but under the discipline of enlightened self-interest and moral responsibility.

Thus it is that Americans were assured the flexibilities necessary to progress. Thus it is that always in these United States, the unintended, the unpredictable, the apparently irrational has seemed to carry us forward.

*A few examples:*

*Consider the settlement of Kentucky.* Richard Henderson and his land company were responsible for it. Any intelligent man in power would have stopped them in the interest

of the general welfare because Kentucky was a wild and lawless country. It was already growing too fast and threatened rebellion against the United States and trouble with Spain.

But Judge Henderson went ahead, and with the aid of Daniel Boone, he organized his company and sold Kentucky land to settlers. He sold it on credit, and would have made a tremendous fortune if the settlers had ever paid out. The rambunctious Kentuckians drove off the installment collectors with guns. The Henderson Land Company went broke. But Kentucky was settled — *a full hundred years ahead of schedule!*

*Consider the Louisiana Purchase*, which extended the United States from the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains. No one in authority had any intention of buying that land. The general feeling was that it was no good and anyway there was too much of it. Even the most forward-looking people saw the Mississippi as our permanent western frontier. The great river was a natural geographical boundary. Jefferson himself expressed the view that it would take another 200 years (about 2000 A.D.) before there'd be any cities in the Mississippi valley.

But Kentucky, as had been foreseen, began to make trouble. The isolated western settlers threatened to join Spain so they could have a seaport on the Spanish-held Gulf of Mexico. Jefferson saw that the whole West — that is to say, the eastern half of the Mississippi valley — would be lost unless the United States could get access to the Gulf. All that he wanted was a port, just one little bay.

But two American commissioners in Paris — on the spur of the moment and without authority from Washington — bought the whole of the Louisiana territory for fifteen million dollars.

This wide expanse of territory really belonged to Spain,

but Napoleon sold it and took a chance on his armies settling the matter with Spain.

Jefferson was aghast when he heard the news and came within an inch of repudiating the purchase. But the province of Louisiana became a part of the United States and the expansion continued westward.

California was torn from Mexico, as a surreptitious personal adventure of General Fremont's – connived in by Senator Benton of Missouri who sent him word to move quickly before he was stopped. It was done at a time when no one dreamed there was gold in those foothills and thoughtful men pointed out that California's soil was worthless because the United States already had more land than Americans could use – that for centuries to come the population on the Pacific coast would not be sufficient to provide a market for its farm products.

Everywhere you look in American history you find examples of things seeming to happen by accident – without intention.

Americans have never had an overall plan. They had something more important: They had personal freedom to plan their own affairs *and the avalanche of human energy resulting from that freedom was sweeping from the Atlantic to the Pacific – from the Great Lakes to the Rio Grande.*

In seventy-five years, within a man's lifetime, France and Russia had vanished from the continent. England had been pushed back on the north; Spain had yielded the Floridas, New Mexico, Arizona, California and Texas.\*

---

\*

I realize that the Lone Star State doesn't belong in this general grouping. With its own revolutionary leaders – its Austins and its Houstons and its Ebenezer Foxes who died to the last man at the Battle of the Alamo – the story of Texas parallels that of the United States. But since there isn't room in this book to do full justice to the Texans we'll leave them to work out their own affairs which, in common with the Cavaliers, they've always managed to do "*with an engaging gallantry and charm.*" (Ditto California and at least two other states.)

The whole vast extent of this country had been covered by one nation, a tumultuous multitude of free men – men of heterogeneous races and creeds – living under the weakest government in all the world.

*The people who had been left to shift for themselves – the people who had learned the lessons of realism and learned them the hard way – these were the people who were creating a New World and carrying forward The Revolution that was beginning to shake the foundations of the Old World.*

## CHAPTER 17

# The Revolution Spreads



*“An army of principles,”* declared Thomas Paine, *“will penetrate where an army of soldiers cannot. It will succeed where diplomatic management would fail; neither the Rhine, the Channel, nor the oceans can arrest its progress. It will march on the horizon of the world, and it will conquer.”*

Many Europeans had joined the Americans during the war and they carried home the sentiments of Paine, as well as the sentiments of

Lafayette who said, *“For a nation to love liberty – it is sufficient that she know it.”*

And there were converts among the mercenary soldiers who had been brought over from Europe to fight for Britain. Many of them were coming to the same conclusion as the captured Hessian who confided to Paine: *“America is a fine, free country. I know the difference from knowing my own. In my country, if the Prince says Eat straw – we Eat straw!”*

*The sentiment for freedom was spreading.*

Thirteen years after the Declaration of Independence for human rights, the oxcarts and roving hogs were cleared from New York’s Main Street to make way for the inauguration of General George Washington as the first President of the United States of America.

Just two months later a group of freedom-loving Frenchmen declared themselves a National Assembly and set about to develop a French Constitution, patterned after the American model.



Lafayette, with the aid of Jefferson, had carried the Revolution to Europe.

The people of France adopted the American colors: red, white and blue. They called their leaders "The Americans" and named General George Washington as an honorary citizen of the New French Republic.

They sent for Thomas Paine and gave him French citizenship. When the news got out, Paine was elected by three different French Provinces to serve as their representative at the National Convention. So the author of "Common Sense" sat in the inner councils with Lafayette and the French Revolutionists as they debated their plans and policies under the American flag and the French tri-color – with portraits of George Washington and Benjamin Franklin gazing down upon them.

The initial effort met with reverses but the New Revolution – the REAL Revolution was on the march.

During the period 1810-1812 it was spreading southward in the Western World. There were revolts in Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay.

In 1813 Mexico declared its independence from Spain and in 1819 the people of Colombia took the same action.

Late in 1814, the Treaty of Ghent brought an end to the War of 1812. It was more or less of a draw, but the new American nation had held its own against the might of Britain's Navy, and Americans were no longer molested on the high seas.

In 1822 Brazil proclaimed its independence from Portugal and in 1890 it was set up as a republic with its former provinces united under a constitution patterned after ours.

In 1823 the President of the United States announced, through the *Monroe Doctrine*, that Americans would resist any attempts on the part of the Old World to interfere with revolutionary progress in the Western Hemisphere.

Back in Europe the struggle for freedom continued with mixed results and in the 1840's thousands of defeated revolutionists fled to America. (They came especially from Germany where the fight for freedom seemed hopeless.)

In 1848 the Swiss, whose struggle against Authority dated back to the legendary period of William Tell, revised their confederation and set up a Constitutional Republic patterned after the American model – with two legislative bodies, one to represent the different cantons (states) the other to represent the Swiss nation as a whole. Switzerland is really deserving of a special chapter in this book. In common with the Saracens, the Swiss have been neglected by the historical analysts. It is highly significant that their little Republic, imbedded in the center of Old World conflict, has kept out of the big wars, and the protection afforded by the Alps is only part of the reason. (See final chapter.)

In the 1850's, Garibaldi, who had been fighting for freedom in South America, carried the Revolution to his native land of Italy.

**I**N THE 1860's Americans fought to abolish slavery once and for all. At least that's usually thought of as the cause of the War Between the States and it was a just cause – except that freeing the slaves was already well on the way toward a peaceful solution. But underlying it all was the matter of States' rights versus Federal domination.

Among other things, it involved the tariff issue which had long been a bone of contention between the industrial States and the agricultural States. Grass roots Americans had for many years been fighting against high tariff – on the grounds that it violated the principle of special privileges to none.

The Southern States wanted free ports. The Federal Government insisted on uniform tariffs at all ports – and the election of 1860 meant *higher* tariffs.

Northerners fought to save the American Revolution by *saving the Union*. Southerners fought to save the Revolution by *defending the rights of States*.

During the War Between the States, European troops moved into Mexico, *thus proving that the Northerners were right*.

But the drifting away from the Constitutional balance of power, which has been going on ever since, *may yet prove that the Southerners were right*.

At any rate the slaves were freed and the Declaration of Independence applied to all.

## LAPSES

In 1898 Americans went out of these United States to fight for The Revolution in behalf of Cuba – against Spanish tyranny.


Cuba was freed from Old World oppression but our Federal Government took it over.

In that same year the Filipinos proclaimed their independence from Spain, but the United States instead of supporting their efforts, moved in and fought them for four bloody years and bought the Philippine Islands from Spain and paid for them.

While the record is not blameless, these actions were later repudiated. Cuba and the Philippines were released.

Since that time, America's attempts to support the cause of freedom in other lands, tends to make up for our earlier lapses into Old World tyranny, but our support would be far more productive if we would do a better job of *sowing the seed* instead of merely *donating the fruit*.

**But so much for a rapid glance at the  
first century of the Third Revolutionary  
Movement – in its broader aspects.**



PART FOUR

**Fruits of Freedom**

## CHAPTER 18

# Inventive Progress\*



*The American Revolution had its beginning under living conditions scarcely changed since the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Colonial women gathered their own firewood and cooked over open fires just as women had cooked since the dawn of history and just as more than two-thirds of the women on this earth are cooking today. They spun thread and wove coarse cloth, with the spindle and loom handed down from the early Egyptians. Every housewife made her own soap and candles and carried water from the spring or well. Crude millstones dating back to ancient Babylon, ground the grain that American farmers cut with knives and threshed with flails that were older than history.*

Such were the conditions when our forefathers threw off the shackles of Old World tyranny to the end that human beings could be in control of their own lives and make full use of their individual initiative.

The outburst of human energy was terrific, and in no way is it better illustrated than by the inventive progress that immediately took place.

---

\* This chapter is based on material gathered over a long period of years and from a wide variety of sources which are high-spotted on page 231 ff. But I especially want to express appreciation to my friend the late Carl Crow—and his book *The Great American Customer*—Harper & Brothers, 1943.

In 1793 Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin which would do the work of four dozen men. But that's only part of the story. Whitney's invention made it commercially profitable to cultivate the short fiber "green-seed" cotton that grew wild in the foothills of Virginia and the Southeastern States. (In contrast to the long staple or "sea island" variety, the lint stuck so tenaciously to the seed that only a few ounces a day could be separated by hand.)

### FAR REACHING EFFECTS

The lower processing costs increased the market for all varieties of cotton. Acreage was greatly expanded and the Southern States entered an era of high prosperity.

In less than 10 years the annual production of cotton in America had increased from less than 5,000,000 pounds to over 50,000,000 pounds.

New England shared in the prosperity: The availability of cotton in such large quantities and at low prices, stimulated the development of carding and weaving machinery and, a few years later at Waltham, Massachusetts, *for the first time in the history of the world*, raw cotton was turned into finished cloth under the roof of one factory.

Extra clothes could now be had at prices within the reach of all. It would no longer be necessary for the housewife to work overtime at her spinning wheel and hand loom. Thanks to Eli Whitney, she could have an occasional evening for rest and recreation.\*

\*

---

By way of anti-climax, it's disappointing to note that Whitney himself made not one red cent out of the cotton gin. Section VIII of the Federal Constitution provided that inventors should for a period of time, be granted the exclusive right to their original ideas. (It was not so much a matter of protecting the inventor, but of making sure that new ideas were made public.) As Whitney found to his sorrow, property rights, as applied to inventions, were not generally understood and patents didn't afford much protection on a thing like a cotton gin which could be made in any blacksmith shop.

## MASS PRODUCTION

In 1799 the same Eli Whitney, through the influence of Thomas Jefferson, took a contract to build muskets for the War Department and his work on that project was one of the important mileposts in the development of modern mass-production technique.

Whitney is frequently spoken of as the *inventor* of mass-production but that is hardly accurate.

Back in England in the early 1680's, a man named Sir Dudley North had outlined a program of mass production with particular reference to the building of ships.

## PROPHET WITHOUT HONOR

Sir Dudley's analysis and proposal were presented in a paper entitled "Considerations Upon the East India Trade" which stands today as a remarkable document on the fundamentals of mass production – although Sir Dudley didn't call it "*mass-production*."

He was much concerned about the confusion and *bepuzlement* that were being caused the working man as a result of having to switch back and forth from one type of job to another type of job.

Sir Dudley wanted to "abate" such unnecessary confusion by laying things out in advance and assigning jobs of "different variety to different artists – of different skills and talents."

Sir Dudley also foresaw the possibilities of reducing costs, without "*abating the wages of the labourer*."

But Sir Dudley was ahead of his time. The idea of increasing production through systematic planning was too revolutionary to be given serious consideration. And the idea of making things easier for the working man was downright anti-social. (More about that just a little later.)

A hundred years later, Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations* expanded on the principles that had been laid down



by Sir Dudley North. But mass production had made little headway. Ships were being built the same as always – and with no *abatement* in the confusion.\*

About all that Adam Smith could find to report along lines of practical progress was that the principle of specialized operations was being applied to the manufacture of *dressmakers' pins*.

That was in the year 1776.

On this side of the Atlantic, in that same historic year, a rumor came out of Rhode Island that a tack maker, named Jeremiah Wilkinson, had perfected a new invention that would boost his production to several thousand tacks a day – *per man*.

Jeremiah's "new invention" turned out to be nothing more than a scheme for fastening a dozen bits of metal in a vise so that, with a broad-faced hammer, the heads could all be pounded at the same time.

Today such a procedure seems perfectly obvious but in those days it was startling news and represented an important step towards modern manufacturing efficiency.

## INTERCHANGEABILITY

But mass production, if applied to anything beyond the simplest kind of article, depends not alone on division of labor and multiple operations, but on the principle of *uniformly accurate interchangeable parts*.

Whitney pioneered the idea of interchangeability as a fundamental principle of production and he successfully applied the principle to a product that must be made with the greatest precision.

Guns had always been built by hand. Each part had to be laboriously filed, lapped and fitted together by highly

\*

---

Production-minded Americans, who probably never heard of Sir Dudley, were the first to produce ships on a mass production basis – and they didn't get around to it until World War I.

skilled gunsmiths. There was no division of labor. No one had ever worried about abating the confusion. Each worker made everything from the stock to the trigger spring. Each gun was slightly different from every other gun and each part in each gun was different from the corresponding part in any other gun.

Whitney proposed to substitute highly specialized machine operations for the less uniform hand operations. Thus, each piece would be made exactly as it ought to be in its final form.

This would not only reduce the assembly operations to a routine procedure but would greatly simplify the problem of repairs. It would no longer be necessary to do a lot of expert filing and fitting to replace a worn or broken part.

The principle of interchangeability would make it possible to repair a gun right on the battlefield – without the aid of a professional gunsmith.

Whitney's contract called for the manufacture of 10,000 muskets over a two year period, and government officials, thinking in terms of piecemeal or handicraft production, naturally assumed that deliveries would be made at an even rate of about 100 per week.

But it is a characteristic of mass production that, while it's a *quicker* way and a *better* way to build things *once you get started*, it takes a long time to get started.\*

---

\*

As Charles F. Kettering has aptly observed, it's analogous to the publishing business. It takes considerable time to set the type and make the engravings – correct the proofs, take care of “make-ready” etc. – but once the presses get going it's just about as easy to run off a million as it is to run off a few thousand. In the printing business the necessity for all this preliminary work is rather generally recognized but it is not generally understood that mass manufacturing is the same kind of problem – only more so. The story of Whitney has its parallel in the early days of World War II when industry was being heckled by people who were ignorant of this principle – who thought it was just a matter of turning on the spigot.

Around a hundred different machines are required to produce guns of uniformity on a mass production basis – not to mention the special tools, jigs, fixtures etc. that have to be made to order.

Even with the highly perfected techniques, facilities and “know-how” of today, it would take about six months to buy and install the machinery and equipment to produce quality guns on a quantity basis.

*But back in 1799 it was not just a matter of going out and buying the machinery.*

It was before the age of the specialized tool industry. Most of the equipment that Whitney had to have just didn't exist. It had to be designed and built from scratch.

The brilliant, ambitious and audacious Whitney (unwittingly perhaps) had taken on the job of laying the groundwork for the modern machine tool industry without which few, if any, of our manufactured products of today would be available at prices within the reach of the typical person.

It would have been much easier to have gone ahead and made the guns by hand and presumably the first of them were made partly by hand, but at the end of a year only 500 muskets had been delivered.

The War Department was getting impatient and demanded a show-down.

Whitney was summoned to Washington to appear before a committee of experts. He knew he was in for trouble unless he could get them interested in his broad undertaking.

He appeared before the committee with a box containing the loose parts for 10 guns. Without ceremony, he dumped them on the conference table and like a jubilant child with a new toy he put on a demonstration of what could be accomplished through the use of special machinery, tools, jigs and fixtures. *With parts chosen at random, and without any filing or fitting, he assembled two guns before their very eyes and passed them around for inspection!*

It was an impressive demonstration, but the committee had to consider the practical aspects. The government had ordered not 10 guns or 510 guns, but *10,000* guns. The time was half up and Whitney himself had to admit that he wouldn't be able to meet the schedule. But he fared better than Sir Dudley North, and with the support of his friend President Jefferson, the contract was extended.

As time went on, Whitney had to get additional extensions, but the order was finally filled and the United States entered the War of 1812 with 10,000 of the most perfect muskets that had ever been made.

*For the first time in the history of the world, precision firearms could be produced in almost unlimited quantities.*

The War of 1812 was won and in the years that followed, the conquest and settlement of the West was greatly expedited through the application of Whitney's techniques by Samuel Colt.

But of far greater importance, Whitney had laid the foundation for the quantity production of complex civilian products such as the bicycle, the typewriter, the Linotype, motion picture machines, electric refrigerators and motor cars.

Without machine tools and the advantage of interchangeability made possible through the use of machine tools, it has been estimated that even the simplest, cheapest, skimpiest kind of automobile could not be built for less than \$20,000. And the cost of keeping it in repair would be even further out of line.

## LUXURIOUS GADGET

Eli Terry, a clocksmith of Plymouth, Connecticut, inspired by what he had learned of Whitney's undertaking, announced that he was building 500 clocks – all of the same identical design, which he would sell for around \$10 apiece as against the customary price of \$25.

This was even more startling than Wilkinson's new method of making tacks.

A tack was a very simple thing but a clock was a mysterious, delicate and highly complicated mechanism.

Clocks had been built back in the days of the Pharaohs but up to the time of Eli Terry they had always been the ornamental luxuries of kings and princes. The common man had depended on the sun and the stars.

From the Old World viewpoint, time was unimportant and conservation of human energy also seemed unimportant.

***It is only when men are free that they begin to place a value on their time – and when men begin to place a value on human time they begin to realize the importance of preserving human life.***

Down through the ages, the principal business had always been war. When a people won a war they made slaves of the defeated people. Or, if they lost, they became slaves of their conquerors. In either case there was always a surplus of burden-bearers. Long hours of drudgery helped to keep the slaves submissive so there was no incentive to develop labor-saving techniques – no point in worrying about time.

Under such conditions there was no place for the Eli Whitneys or the Eli Terrys. If any had cropped up they would have been frowned upon as *enemies of the social order*. That's why Sir Dudley and his forward-looking ideas were thrown in the discard. Certain of his more daring writings were suppressed until years after his death when they were published *anonymously* by a group of cautious admirers.

Terry was no newcomer in the clock business. For some years past he'd been canvassing the New England countryside selling high priced clocks – *on the installment basis*.

But the idea of producing clocks of uniform quality, at prices low enough to make them available to every family, was something new and radical.

Eli Terry, as far as I can find out, was the first to visualize the possibilities of the American idea of low cost and big volume through mass production and wide distribution.

By the end of three years he and his partner *Seth Thomas* had built and sold over 5,000 clocks.

Others were attracted to the field. Competition increased. Quality improved. Wages went up. Prices went down.

*The unique American formula was in the making!*

#### NO SALES COST

One manufacturer, a man named Peck, saw possibilities in the export trade. But his first shipment of low-priced clocks to England was held up by the Liverpool Customs House on grounds of suspicion. The Customs officials knew the value of clocks and they knew that clocks just couldn't be produced at the low prices shown on the Peck invoice. It was quite obvious that fraudulent payments had been made on the side in order to avoid the full effect of the tariff. British law provided that under such conditions the goods in question would be confiscated by paying the amount of the invoice - *plus 10%*.

The clocks never reached the consignee. They were taken over by the government. What the government did with them, I don't know.

But Peck, being a practical man, didn't put up any argument. He was a hardheaded manufacturer, instead of a salesman. The 10% extra profit was pure velvet and he rather relished the idea of disposing of his output without any sales expense - *or credit risk*.

He added more workers and continued shipping his clocks to Britain and collecting from the Customs Office until they finally got wise to him.

*The records are incomplete, but I like to think that the British, at about that time, began to conclude that maybe Sir Dudley had something!*

However, it took another hundred years to develop and extend mass-production techniques to a point where the worker no longer had to worry about the *confusion and bewilderment* of switching from one job to another.

Sir Dudley's dream was fulfilled – not in England – but here in the United States. It was brought to its fruition through the ingenuity of American production engineers.

But scarcely had it reached its full perfection when other forms of confusion were injected into the situation.

Although of an artificial, man-made nature, they are so befuddling that even a Sir Dudley North might have difficulty in pointing a way to the solution.

## 6000 versus 160

Under the Old World concept of a static economy, operating under bureaucratic control, human beings, for thousands of years lived – and died young – *in hunger, filth and disease – working ceaselessly at back-breaking drudgery to keep life in wretched bodies.*

For thousands of years, when not fighting wars, they managed to build pig-sty shelters and to sow grain and cook meat, yoke oxen, and chain slaves to mills and oars.

Then in this New World, in the brief period of 160 years, Americans have created an entirely different mode of life – with improvements and advances in the scale of living beyond the utmost imaginings of all preceding ages.

Americans have disproved the pagan superstition of a static universe and have given a new meaning to the word *progress.*

*To keep us going ahead in that same direction it is important not to forget the things that have brought us thus far.*

ECONOMISTS AND STATISTICIANS are inclined to take the end of the Civil War as the milepost marking the beginning of America's first great era of accelerated progress.

In terms of increased output and higher standards of living, that is true, but the seeds of that progress were being sown by the preceding generations.

Most of the things that we have today are traceable, directly or indirectly, to what was going on in the minds of those who were blazing the trails a hundred years ago – and a hundred and fifty years ago.

That's when the basic foundations were being laid, and it is questionable if there has ever been a time when human energy and original, independent, creative thinking was so intense and so well-directed as in the years immediately following the Revolutionary War.

### ELUSIVE LAG

In the progress of a nation, just as in the decline of a nation, there is always a lag between cause and effect.

This is an extremely important point and the failure to recognize it seems to account for most of the mistakes and misery of mankind through all the ages.

Progress *or lack of progress* at any given time depends on what was happening in the *minds* of men and women at some previous time.

The histories of Greece, Rome and Spain afford abundant evidence.

Or, looking to the future, instead of the past, *America's progress in the years ahead, depends on the American thinking of today.*

The *long-pull* prospects depend – not on us older folks – but on the thinking of the younger people who will be at the helm – ten years, twenty years, thirty, forty and fifty years hence.



As individuals, what is their outlook on life? Are they *fatalistic* or *self-reliant*? What is the influence of the home – and how does it stack up against fifty and a hundred years ago? What's going on in the schoolrooms? What is the philosophy of our educators – and of men in public office?

**One of the best ways to insure future progress is to keep clearly in mind the things that have been responsible for our past progress – as well as the things that *may* have kept America from being as great as it might have been.**

**B**UT SO MUCH FOR THE DIGRESSION because this chapter is supposed to deal with inventive progress as affecting our economic growth and our high scale of living. And yet I'm not sure that I should apologize because it all comes back to the effective use of human energy, and the effective use of human energy depends on the mental and *moral* outlook of the individual persons who make up a society.

## PARALLEL EFFORTS

As already indicated, it is difficult to trace the genealogy of any invention or discovery, and any attempt to do so is accompanied by the danger of omissions and inaccuracies.

Economic needs have a way of permeating society, so that it is a commonplace in the history of invention to find minds far distant from one another in time and space, wrestling with the same problems – working independently but producing results that are roughly identical.

Rarely does anything spring full bloom. Progress advances by degrees – each improvement paving the way for the next, and since the advent of the printing press and the growth of scientific societies, the benefits of the independent efforts pyramid on one another to an increasing degree – and at an accelerated rate.

The more complicated the product, the harder it is to trace the genesis of its development.

## BACKGROUND

To tell the story of the steam engine, for example, would take a sizable volume – *with a “begat” chapter as long as the Book of Chronicles!*

James Watt is usually thought of as the inventor and it is true that Watt, more than any other individual, was responsible for the *type* of engine that ushered in the modern age of power. He introduced the *condenser* principle and translated reciprocating motion into *rotary* motion. But steam engines of a crude variety had been used to pump water out of English coal mines before James Watt was born.

As a matter of fact, the principle of the steam engine had been understood back in the days of ancient Greece and we know that in Alexandria, Egypt, a man named Hero built a steam turbine in the year 130 B.C. But an invention (like a natural resource) doesn't amount to much unless and until something is done about it.

It always takes time to bring an embryonic idea to its full fruition – and the unavoidable lag is often prolonged by well-meaning people who still cling to the pagan concept of a static universe.

## TORMENTORS OF PROGRESS

A boat propelled by steam was launched on European waters in the year 1707. It was built by the French scientist Denis Papin who, at the time, was living in Germany. He made a successful voyage down the River Fulda. But at the town of Munden he was attacked by an organized gang of boatmen. His new contraption was destroyed and Papin barely escaped with his life. Thus, the pressure groups, through the use of violence, retarded the development of steam propulsion for almost a century.

It was in 1807, just an even 100 years after Denis Papin had run afoul of the river gangsters, that Fulton's "Clermont" made its maiden trip from New York to Albany.

Robert Fulton is usually thought of as the inventor of the first American steamboat but he was more of a promoter than an inventor. No less than sixteen steamboats had been built and operated in this country before the launching of the Clermont.

The half-forgotten genius, John Fitch of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, built a steamboat in 1786, and during the following 10 years, with the aid of Harry Voight and others, he built five additional steamboats, all of them successful and each better than its predecessor.

When Washington was still president, fifteen years ahead of Fulton's Clermont, Fitch's fourth boat the "*Perseverance*" was operating on a daily schedule up and down the Delaware, carrying passengers between Philadelphia and Trenton, N. J.

But in contrast to Fulton, John Fitch was a poor promoter and he was too engrossed in his work to bother about the political angles.

### STEVENS, LIVINGSTON *and* ROOSEVELT

In the period between Fitch and Fulton, there was the able engineer, Col. John Stevens, who launched his first boat in 1802.

His third boat, the "Phoenix," was completed simultaneously with the Clermont. The Phoenix was equipped with an improved engine designed and built by Col. Stevens himself, whereas the Clermont's engine was imported from England.

But Stevens was at a disadvantage, because Fulton's backer, Chancellor Livingston, through political pull, had gotten a 20-year monopoly on the operation of steamboats in and around New York State. Also it seems that Nicholas

Roosevelt, a former associate of Stevens', had thrown his support to Fulton's group.

At any rate the monopolistic set-up was too much for Stevens to buck. So while the Clermont was chugging its way up the peaceful Hudson, the Colonel braved the waters of the Atlantic and took his new boat from Hoboken to Philadelphia which, incidentally, was the first *ocean* voyage ever made under steam power.

Livingston and Roosevelt tried to extend their monopoly over the entire United States but the newly freed Americans didn't like the idea of governmental restraint and in less than a generation independent operators had covered the western waters with steamboats of their own contrivance.

And in the meantime the dynamic New World had challenged the static Old World by making the first ocean crossing in a boat powered by steam. It was the good ship "Savannah" which crossed to Cork, Ireland, in the year 1818.

**T**HE DEMAND FOR HOUSES following the Revolutionary War was as great or greater than it was following the second World War.

Lumber was plentiful. The bottleneck was nails. Iron nails had been in use in the Roman Empire at the time of Christ, but they had always been laboriously made by hand and the forging of nails for the building of a house took about as much time as the construction of the house itself.

Legend has it that in colonial days old houses were deliberately burned to the ground and the ashes sifted just to salvage the hand-wrought nails.

They sold by the dozen at prices not much lower than they now bring in the New England antique shops. Thomas

Jefferson kept a dozen slaves busy forging nails to keep up with the building activities on his Monticello estate.

But this was all changed when in 1795 Jacob Perkins of Newburyport, Massachusetts developed a machine that would turn out 60,000 nails a week.

**T**HE HISTORY OF NAILS is paralleled by that of many other ordinary household items which today are bought at the nearest dime store without a second thought.

The thrifty colonial housewife could have told you without a moment's hesitation just how many pins, needles and buttons she had in her sewing basket. — just as the head of the house carried a mental inventory covering his meager stock of nails, tacks, screws and scraps of metal.

Brass buttons sold for 10cts. apiece until Paul Revere, in 1801, worked out a machine that would roll brass of uniform thickness and the button manufacturers of Waterbury, Connecticut, began stamping out buttons on presses operated by a water wheel.

Pins and needles were especially treasured. They were larger than those in common use today and far more expensive — especially pins — because the heads were made separately and welded or brazed in place.

Selling pins “by the paper” didn't come into practice until 1844 when a small manufacturer in Derby, Connecticut, worked out a way to produce them entirely by machinery at the rate of 2,000,000 a week.

Up to that time ordinary pins sold for as high as 20 cents apiece and were looked upon as appropriate gifts for weddings and at Christmas time. They also took the place of small change to supplement barter between neighboring families — which, incidentally, is the origin of the phrase “pin money.”

## FAR-REACHING EFFECTS

As in the case of the cotton gin, it's almost impossible to measure the value of any useful invention. The dollar volume of the increased industrial production is only a part of the story – and may be greatly exceeded by the gains in human efficiency. Consider the effect of steamships, railroads, telephones, automobiles, airplanes, etc., in releasing time and energy for other purposes. (Or to take a less spectacular example: *imagine the time wasted by the colonial housewife in searching for one of her 20 cent pins!*)

Consider the savings in time and human energy and the thousand and one improvements in living that we owe to electricity. The story is so involved and so far-reaching that it would take a whole book to develop it, even if I had the necessary knowledge and a talent for calculations of such astronomical proportions.

## DOWN TO EARTH

But here's just one example, a rather simple example – certainly less spectacular than either electricity or steam power.

*It has to do with plows.*

Plows had been in use since the earliest dawn of history but they had remained practically unchanged down through thousands of years. At the time of the American Revolution they were still being made from the prongs of trees – sometimes with a bit of metal fastened to the tip.

It was not the type of problem that appealed to the high-brow scientists. The tilling of the soil had always been left to peasants and slaves – so why worry?

But in the New World where men were free, a vast agricultural empire was opened up as a result of Yankee ingenuity being applied to the improvement of this ancient tool.

In colonial days the vast midwestern prairie lands and a

good part of the Mississippi Valley were looked upon as worthless. Early visitors spoke of the sweeping plains as a "land ocean" that would forever remain wild and uncultivated.

This conclusion was not without a reason. In fact it was based on several reasons:

First of all, the prairie country, in contrast to the eastern area, was not covered with forests and, although the cutting down of trees and the clearing of land had been the bane of their existence, the pioneer settlers looked with suspicion on *any* land that didn't *have* to be cleared. They reasoned that if it wouldn't grow trees then it just couldn't be of any value for growing crops.

The prairies were covered by a tough primeval sod. When dry, the ordinary plow wouldn't cut through and when softened by rain the rich loam underneath was so sticky that it wouldn't shed off the plow blade. The fertile soil of the river valleys was described as "*too thick to drink and too thin to plow.*"

Cast iron plows had been tried but without much success. They wouldn't "scour". They were too heavy to handle and there was an age-old prejudice that a plow made of metal would poison the crops.

But a Yankee inventor, a blacksmith by trade, who migrated from Vermont to the Mississippi Valley, was not so skeptical.

His name was *John Deere* and instead of using iron, he made a plow out of the very finest steel that was then available.

From an old buzz-saw disc he trimmed out the required parts and, on patterns carved from a log, he carefully pounded the sheets into the proper shapes and bolted them on a well-constructed hardwood frame.

When you come right down to it, John Deere's invention could hardly be called an "invention." About all he did was

to find a *new use* for an *old material* and carry out his ideas in a thoroughly workmanlike manner. \*

*But John Deere's plow cut through the sod as clean as a razor and the sticky loam shed off of the plowshare - like butter sliding off a hot knife.*

True, it was heavier than its wooden predecessor, but John Deere was a giant of a man and he trudged across the prairie lands with his new-fangled plow thrown over his shoulder, just to overcome the weight argument.

And after a few seasons of increasingly good crops, the realistic, free-minded settlers cast aside the superstition that metal would poison the soil, and the prairie country was on the boom.

## THE PAY-OFF

A big industry grew out of John Deere's simple invention, and a number of *other* industries followed in its wake because binders, reapers, tractors and other advanced types of farm machinery came as a natural result of having found a way to plow the prairie sod.

Millions of acres of the most productive soil in the world were brought into use. Prosperous towns and cities sprang up in the vast prairie "waste lands" and John Deere's plow,

---

\* Years ago, someone down on the farm told me that John Deere invented the knife edge wheel that runs ahead of the plowshare to cut an incision for it to follow. But that's not true. The *rolling coulter* was in use before the time of John Deere and his plow didn't even have one. Indeed it would be difficult to prove that there was anything entirely original in John Deere's plow. The efforts of other Americans, directed along similar lines, paralleled and even preceded those of Deere.

When I ran into these disconcerting facts, I started to throw out the story. Then I thought maybe it was an even better story because it illustrates the very important point that: Human progress doesn't depend so much on the flashes of high genius, but on people who do a bang-up job in carrying out their ideas - or the ideas of others. And while I am using John Deere's name *primarily as a symbol*, there can be little argument that he, more than anyone else, was the man who got things started in the prairie "wastelands."



along with the more intricate inventions of Cyrus McCormick and others, opened up similar opportunities for increased agricultural production in all parts of the world – including the *Russian Ukraine*.

It staggers the imagination to think how much the wealth of mankind was increased as a result of John Deere's simple contribution. Maybe it would have come without freedom to invent and freedom to share in the rewards of inventive efforts, but there's no escaping the fact that plows had remained practically unchanged down through all the ages – *while the peoples of the world were going hungry*.

**I** DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH MONEY John Deere made as a result of finding a way to plow the rich prairie lands. I doubt if he got any more than he deserved, although I wouldn't attempt to say how much he was entitled to get – nor would I know how to go about figuring it.

I guess one way to do it would be on the basis of how many hours it took him to think up the idea and develop the experimental model.

The trouble is that inventive genius doesn't operate on an hourly basis. More often than not, the worthwhile ideas come in leisure moments – as a result of an interest in the job that extends beyond working hours.

From all I can gather, John Deere had been turning the problem over in his mind for about a year before he hit on the solution. But a year's pay would hardly be enough – *even if you figured it on a portal to portal basis, at maximum ceiling rates and with triple time for overtime*.

Then too, it's quite possible that John Deere may have followed some false leads and spent time on other ideas that didn't pay off. It might be that some of these futile efforts were the stepping stones that led him to a solution of the plowing problem.

But never mind how liberally we might deal with him on an hourly basis, there's the danger of short-changing John Deere – *and I want no part of it!*

So let's take another approach and go at it from the standpoint of “Ability to Pay”:

Since Deere's sod-buster turned worthless land into highly valuable land, one might argue that he was entitled to a rather liberal percentage of the increased wealth arrived at by calculating the before and after value of the vast Mississippi Valley – including the fertile farmlands of Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas (and without counting the Russian Ukraine).

Roughly speaking it represents substantially the area that Jefferson bought from Napoleon for 15 million dollars, but when it was brought under cultivation the value increased to about 20 billion dollars – which would mean an added wealth of \$19,885,000,000.

But that doesn't throw any light on what John Deere's *share* should have been – because it took the cooperative efforts of millions of free men extending over several generations to provide the “follow-through” and get the job done.

It's true that John Deere played an important part in getting things started, but I'm using his name more as a symbol and much of the credit belongs to the McCormicks, James Oliver and other inventors, none of whom could have gotten very far without the help of still others who supported their efforts – including:

- those who put up the money to build the factories and equip them with tools.
- those who used the tools.
- those who helped to develop new and better tools.
- those who worked out new and better methods for using the new and better tools.

- those who contributed to management, distribution and service.
- and last but not least, the up and coming farmers who were willing to take a chance, leave their comfortable homes in the East and risk their money (and their lives) opening up a vast new country.

I don't know of anybody who would be smart enough to figure their various shares of the increased wealth.

It's a tough problem any way you look at it and I guess maybe the only way to do it is the way that it actually *was* done, namely: - through a free and unhampered balancing out of the incentives and rewards between the various individuals who played a part.

Perhaps it's fortunate that back in the days of John Deere the major emphasis was on doing things that *increased wealth* rather than worrying too much about *how it should be divided*.

Too much stress on how it should have been divided might easily have reduced the amount to be divided - because it would have taken more people to do the figuring than to do the job.

But that's really getting off the subject because I'm merely trying to emphasize the wealth-producing possibilities of new ideas.

Never mind how much money John Deere may have got, it would be insignificant in comparison with the tremendous overall benefits which were shared by millions of people.

And it's just possible that good old John Deere wouldn't have bothered his head about the plowing problem *if he hadn't been living in a free country where an ambitious blacksmith had a chance to become a prosperous manufacturer*.

Free minds are inventive minds. That is why America has always been a land of inventors.

Benjamin Franklin invented a new type stove, which pointed the way to our modern base burner. He invented the rocking chair, the first pair of bifocal spectacles, and his scientific experiments played an important part in laying the foundation for the great electrical development that took place long after his time. And it was the sly, tolerant and benign Franklin who invented the American sense of humor – based on the idea: *don't take yourself (or anyone else) too seriously.*

Thomas Paine also had an inventive mind. Not only was he highly creative as a writer and welder of words, but with geometry as his hobby, he drew up the plans and supervised the construction of the first single-span iron bridge with criss-cross struts.

Jefferson's home at Monticello demonstrates his ability as a master of structural design, and the fittings and furnishings disclose many evidences of his mechanical ingenuity. It was Jefferson who designed the first scientifically curved mould board for a plow.

Also, he played an important part in laying the foundation for the more effective administration of the patent law which, as Abe Lincoln later observed, had "added the fuel of interest to the fire of genius." Since the time of Jefferson, the United States has led the world in the number of patents registered – *twice as many as Great Britain or France and four times as many as Germany.*

**I**N ADDITION TO THE COTTON GIN, the modern steamboat, the prairie sod-buster, the reaper and binder – Americans invented the sewing machine, the typewriter, the Linotype, the telegraph, telephone, phonograph, the motion picture, the airplane, the washing machine, the electric refrigerator and dozens of other electrical appliances.

And Americans invented the techniques of quantity production.

In a broad overall sense, one might argue that mass production, as we know it in this country, is the most important of all inventions because it is only through mass production that the practical benefits of other inventions can be extended to the millions.

But mass production rests on the foundation of another – and an even greater invention.

At the head of the list – the first and foremost of all our inventive contributions – is one that's not ordinarily thought of as an invention. But the fact remains that it is the greatest of them all because it serves as the foundation for all the others and provides the opportunity for their full fruition:

*It is our new and original concept of political structure based on a principle that is just as true, just as real, just as inexorable as any law of physics – the principle of individual liberty and freedom – the principle that each person controls his own life-energy and is responsible for his own acts and for his relationships with others.*

## CHAPTER 19

# Hope *versus* Fear



No one nation or race of people has a monopoly on creative and inventive talent, but new ideas, like natural resources, don't amount to much *unless* and *until* something is done about them. Many of the things that we have today are based on inventions of Old World origin. America's first century of industrial progress was largely a matter of getting something done with the half-baked ideas that had been lying around collecting dust down

through centuries of time – *while the vast majority of people were doing without.*

Inventions and discoveries were being made in the Old World long before the white man came to America – and they are still being made and will continue to be made by the limited number of unquenchable geniuses who persist in their independent thinking – in spite of the static surroundings and without much hope of reward, unless the brain-child has military possibilities.

But when creative workers, in addition to the natural, normal and unavoidable difficulties surrounding their work, find themselves entangled in artificial restrictions and bureaucratic red tape, much of the potential talent will die on the vine – and even the irrepressible genius can accomplish very little without the help of others.

To extend the benefits of a new invention or discovery requires complex networks of supporting talents, skills and physical facilities.

Thus, progress in the direction of *more and better things for more people* depends on maintaining conditions that provide opportunities and incentives extending over a wide front.

There must be:

Opportunities and incentives to INVENT

Opportunities and incentives to USE

*and in between, there must be*

Opportunities and incentives to PRODUCE  
and EXCHANGE.

Here in America such opportunities and incentives have been more far-reaching and more favorable than anywhere else in the world – and it all comes back to the matter of individual freedom.

We've been free to invent, free to try out new ideas and new methods, free to back up the other fellow's business or go in business on one's own – free to take a chance on making a profit – or going broke.

We've been free to trade with each other over wide areas – free to buy what we please and from whom we please – from Maine to California and from Key West to Seattle.

And that, incidentally, is one of the outstanding contrasts between the Old World and the New World:

Try to imagine the problems we'd be up against if our country had been set up like Europe with each State a separate nation – isolated by customs barriers, different languages and different monetary systems. Contrast that with conditions as they actually are – and remember that we barely escaped following the European pattern.

Absence of trade barriers have kept us away from the strained artificiality of each area trying to be self-sufficient. This has resulted in logical specialization on the basis of natural resources and climate: Cotton in the South, flour in

Minneapolis, movies in Hollywood and copper mining in Butte, Montana.

We've been free to choose our own jobs and free to compete with one another for better jobs without any overriding authority dictating to us as to *where we should work, what we would get and how we would have to spend it.*

We've been less afflicted by monopolies, cartels and restrictive labor organizations than any other country.

### DIGRESSION

There may be exceptions, but I'm inclined to the view that objectionable monopolies cannot exist except through acquiescence on the part of the State – either by providing unwarranted legal protection or by failing to perform its proper police functions in suppressing commercial gangsterism. I am not unmindful of the fact that such transgressions are usually the outgrowth of private interests or pressure groups seeking the aid of government to help them “pull their chestnuts out of the fire.” But two wrongs don't make a right – and double guilt lies at the door of those who propose total all-out government monopoly as a remedy for the lesser evils of the infrequent private monopoly.

A private monopoly can usually be broken in one of two ways: People can stop patronizing it by finding substitutes or doing without – or the State can force it to dissolve. But government monopoly is *total monopoly* and since there is no higher power to which to appeal – there is no relief short of rebellion and war.

The only safeguard against the evils of monopoly lies in the direction of maintaining competitive conditions that provide maximum freedom of choice for the consumer.

Please note that I am not using the term “*free enterprise*.” It was once a sound term but the propaganda (both for and against) has given it a pressure group connotation.



**T**HE ONLY SOUND PROGRAM for free competitive enterprise – *and the only program that has a chance to succeed* – is one which concerns itself first, last and always with maintaining freedom for the individual citizen – *and letting the chips fall where they may.*

It's a matter of keeping the way open so that any business or trade group, big or small, may be continually challenged, kept on its toes and even put out of business by any "runner-up" who can demonstrate his or her or their ability to serve the customer better.

It may be argued (and it frequently *is* argued) that free competition is a ruthless and cruel process. But it is not nearly so ruthless and cruel as the opposite philosophy which, down through the ages, has kept the majority of people ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed, embroiled in wars and dying of famine and pestilence.

### HOPE *versus* FEAR

There seems no escaping the fact that human efforts are motivated by *HOPE OF REWARD* on the one hand – and *FEAR OF PUNISHMENT* on the other hand.

The ideal combination is where the rewards are great and reasonably attainable – and where the punishment is not too severe.

America's economic progress is the result of conditions that have provided maximum opportunities for reward – but with the penalties limited to *personal insecurity and business bankruptcy.*

At the other extreme we have the totalitarian state which promises security at the expense of freedom and which attempts to "encourage" initiative by the threat of the concentration camp or the firing squad.

Under free competition, based on personal responsibility and voluntary cooperation, our production of useful goods

and services has exceeded anything ever before accomplished.

True, we are far from perfect and *in some respects we seem to have been drifting backwards.*

To tell the complete story with all the pros and cons would take another book and sooner or later I hope to write such a book – unless someone beats me to it.\*

*The big point is that our progress to date is the result of an entirely new and different form of political structure that has made it possible for human energy and individual initiative to work under their own natural control.*

**B**UT NOW LET'S GET AWAY FROM THE BROAD GENERALITIES and make a little closer analysis of how political structure affects creative thinking and the benefits growing out of such thinking.

While, for illustrative purposes, we will continue to talk in terms of technical inventions, it should be borne in mind that conditions affecting inventive progress in the realm of physics and mechanics have an equal bearing on the development of new ideas and new methods in any field – *from statistical techniques to diaper service!*

#### DYNAMIC *versus* STATIC

The inventive mind is an inquiring mind and the inquiring mind is the mind of a doubter and a challenger. Creative thinkers are never satisfied to let well enough alone. They are continually straying off the beaten path and getting out of step with the normal routine.

Such people don't fit in with the concept of an Authori-

---

\* Among other things it would include some "thought starters" covering three proposals that might help to reduce the fluctuations in the business cycle.

tarian society. Even though their explorations may be confined to the area of physical things, there's always the danger of them turning up something that might disturb the planned economy and discredit the superior wisdom of the overlords.

*But what's wrong with the idea of a government setting up its own bureaus of carefully chosen scientists and inventors to explore new frontiers of progress – under the supervision of those responsible for the overall planning?*

Part of the answer is that nobody is smart enough to select them.

What governmental bureau back in the 1890's, for example, would have picked Henry Ford, the power-house helper, to pioneer the production of low priced automobiles? Even his friends and neighbors had him labeled as a scatterbrain tinkerer.\*

Who among present day Washington officials would be able to pick the Edisons and the Ketterings of 25 years hence?

Who among the most ardent and self-assured advocates of centralized planning would be so bold as to try to define the next great advance in the realms of scientific development, invention and production techniques?

Certainly those assuming the responsibility for mapping out the future would have to consider the disrupting effects of changes due to progress. To ignore the necessity of looking beyond the horizon of things that are already known – would make them *self-confessed* advocates of a static society.

---

\* And assuming that he had been picked, would his contributions have been as great? Bureaucratic red tape always works at cross-purposes to the development of independent thinking. It saps energy that might otherwise be directed into channels of creative usefulness. (Read John Baker's highly significant little book, *Science and the Planned State*, Macmillan, 1945.)

## STUBBORN FACTS

The big difficulty lies in the fact that human energy doesn't work according to any foreordained plan or pattern.

This is especially true in the field of original exploration. In the higher realms of scientific research you can't even tell the researcher what to find out – because the biggest part of the job *is to find out what there is to be found out.*

You can't delegate people to have inspirations. Creative ideas spring from within. They can't be forced from without. Genius is an unpredictable quality. It doesn't work according to any fixed rules or patterns. It turns up in the most unexpected quarters.

Inventive and scientific talent of a high order can't be produced by bureaucratic edict. Nor can it be discovered through any formalized procedure.

## SELF-SELECTION

The only way to do it is through *natural selection*. In other words, let the creative mind discover itself.

That's the only effective process, and its *full effectiveness* depends on maintaining an atmosphere that doesn't *prevent anyone* from using his own initiative.

As a result of personal freedom, here in the U. S. A., the process of natural selection has a chance to sift out the embryonic geniuses from among 140,000,000 people. That's how we got our Eli Whitneys, Charles Goodyears, Thomas Edisons, Michael Pupins, Burbanks, Mergenthalers, Elias Howes, Samuel Morses, and the Wright Brothers.

Nobody selected them, but given an opportunity in a free land, they selected themselves – and forged ahead of their rivals.

No government bureau can ever compete with this natural process of self-selection on a free-for-all and highly competitive basis.

## STIMULUS

The greater the competition, the better the quality of those who reach the top. This is due, not alone to the greater number of aspirants, but to the fact that genius thrives on rivalry. It's not much fun to be an expert in a field that is completely and entirely beyond the understanding of everyone else. Nor would there be much incentive to widen the gap by becoming even more expert. (Why increase the loneliness?)

Galileo would doubtless have risen to greater heights if there had been other astronomers (even lesser astronomers) to criticize and challenge his work *on the basis of factual merit*.

## BY-PRODUCT

And aside from all that, there is a highly important, practical, down-to-earth *by-product* that can only come through the process of natural selection on a basis of free competition between free individuals:

*The maintenance of our American way of life depends just as much on the runners-up as it does on the outstanding geniuses. Thousands of men of varying degrees of talents and skills are needed to work out the less spectacular details that must be taken care of before even the simplest invention or discovery can be made of any practical value in improving the conditions of mankind on a wide scale.*

**T**HUS, the men who don't quite win the race are necessary adjuncts to the top-flight genius who has neither the time nor the temperament to handle the follow-through.

The progress and contributions of scientists, inventors and innovators depend on the opportunities for reward for extra effort.

The reward may take various forms. It may be the endorsement of others engaged in the same or similar work. It may be the emotional stimulation resulting from intelligent debate, argument, and criticism from rivals. It may be widespread fame and acclaim – which presupposes some degree of intelligent interest on the part of the general public.

Underlying all these there is the inner satisfaction of doing a good job, but that's not much of a reward *unless* magnified by recognition from others.

And last, but not least, there is the more tangible form of reward as represented by the pay check – or its equivalent.

But financial gain is not always the most important incentive. This depends on the individual. Among the creative workers, there are those who would get more kick out of a complimentary letter from a rival than they would out of a raise in salary.

But the number of top-flight Galileos is limited, and even the Galileos can do with some extra cash.

The chance for fortune *along with fame* insures a bigger crop of geniuses – as well as runners-up.

And in the less dramatic, down-to-earth fields of practical invention and technological progress, the opportunity for financial reward becomes increasingly important as an incentive.

### TRIPLE ROLE

The size and hence the effectiveness of the financial reward – whether it comes through cash settlement, royalty payments, promotion, or going into business on one's own – depends in the final analysis on the size and the *vitality* of the market for the product or the service.

Here in America it is greater than anywhere else. Although we have less than 7% of the world's population, that's more than made up by the dynamic qualities of 140,000,000 free people.

And here in America the consumers play a role that extends considerably beyond the matter of providing a market. As investors, they supply the tools without which large scale economical production, with high wages, would be impossible.

And in addition they provide something else which – although a bit less tangible – is of equal or even greater importance. It has to do with the readiness to try new things – a distinctly American trait which has a deeper significance than appears on the surface.

Just by way of illustration I'd like to tell the story of an experience that may help to illustrate the point. In fact, it's two stories based on two experiences *illustrating several points* that first got me thinking along these lines:

Some years ago, just before the Second World War, I read an article on inventions and technical progress. In the early part it summarized various stories of American inventions and experiments including the one about Ben Franklin flying his kite during the electric storm, with a brass key attached to the kite string. Considerable point was made of the fact that many great things had sprung from humble and accidental origin.

That was the general tenor of the first part of the article, but along toward the end the author began to get over into some theories on *overall social planning*.

It was then that he seemed to forget about the unpredictable things that had happened in the past, and in theorizing on the future, he tried to draw some hair-splitting distinctions between *useful inventions* and *non-essential gadgets*.

He was particularly critical of automobile design and made special mention of the trend toward automatic transmissions as an example of gadgetry gone rife. To make a long story short, it added up about like this:

*"Right at a time when the world is tottering on the brink of disaster – right when so many important things need to be done – the automobile industry is prostituting its talents and diverting its engineering genius to working out gadgets that relieve people of the inconsequential task of shifting gears by hand."*

Well, it was quite true that the world *was* tottering on the brink of disaster and it was also true that some of the auto-

motive engineers had worked out a way to shift gears automatically. I didn't quite agree that it was a useless gadget, but maybe I was just biased.

Anyway my thoughts turned back to Ben Franklin going out in that storm and flying his kite and it occurred to me in passing that the world was tottering on the brink of disaster even back in those days – and if things had been under “proper control,” Mr. Franklin might not have been able to get a priority for the brass key used in his experiment.

That was back in the 1750's and I'm talking now about the year 1941, just before Pearl Harbor.

The scene shifts to the following year. It was the summer of 1942 when the world sure enough *was* tottering on the brink of disaster. We and our Allies were taking quite a licking in the air and one of the most urgent problems in military aviation was to outdo our enemies on altitude flying.

Some of the engineers felt that the Hydraulic Clutch similar to the one used in the new automatic transmissions might help solve the problem. (That gets into a lot of technicalities relating to atmospheric densities, fuel mixtures, etc., but I won't go into all that except to say that the idea of using Hydraulic Clutches in aircraft engine superchargers had been considered quite impractical and a little promotion seemed in order.)

Anyway I was asked to help write a little book on the subject – that is, on the general subject of airplane engines and altitude flying – *including a special chapter on superchargers with hydraulic clutches.*

Before the book could be published it had to be passed on by the censors. They O.K.'d it all right – that is, from a standpoint of military censorship, but they rather questioned the advisability of mentioning the hydraulic proposition.

Since, from our standpoint, that was one of the main reasons for the book, we balked a little and asked WHY?

They explained that the Germans had tried to use hydraulic clutches in their altitude engines but were giving up the idea because the Germans, in spite of all their technical skill, had never been able to make 'em so they wouldn't give trouble.

I'll skip the next part of the story, except to say that the booklet was published – and without pulling any punches on the hydraulic clutch proposition. I don't know as the booklet had anything to do with it, but the prejudice faded away and shortly thereafter the experience gained in the building of hydraulic clutches for automobile transmissions was diverted to the building of high altitude super-superchargers.



And just a little later on, tanks were being equipped with automatic transmissions not basically different from the ones used in some of the present-day motor cars. This made the driving of a tank so simple that the operator could be trained in a matter of hours instead of weeks. The job no longer called for a muscular giant, and in a pinch the driver could help with the fighting. Along with these advantages and of even greater importance, the gears could be shifted without bringing the tank to a stop. This reduced the danger of getting hit. Thus, in spite of the trouble experienced by the Germans, hydraulic clutches, made in American automobile factories, played an important part in winning the war for ourselves and our Allies – on land as well as in the air.

Adding it all up, my thoughts began to turn back to the article that tried to draw hair-splitting distinctions between *essential* inventions and *unnecessary* gadgets.

And it was then that it began to dawn on me that the responsiveness of 140,000,000 *free people* provides American industry with a proving ground beyond the possibilities of anything that could ever be set up as an adjunct to any factory – in either peace *or war*.

Mass production could never have gotten beyond the experimental stage – in fact it never could have gotten started except through the support of a public that is alert to progress, and which *refuses to accept any preconceived boundary lines between the necessities and the luxuries*.

That's an outstanding contrast between free people – and people whose needs, tastes and desires are regimented in line with some arbitrary overall plan.

Sure, the Germans had had a lot of trouble trying to make hydraulic-drive superchargers, *but America is not Germany*. In this country we don't have to wait for a war to get experience on the quantity production of precision products.

Here in America, around a half-million hydraulic clutches for use in motor cars had been built before we got into the war.

You can't build that many without learning how to build 'em. You can't build 'em without selling 'em and the only place on earth where you could sell 'em is in the good old U. S. A.\*

---

\* This story really should have been set in bolder type except the printer said he was running short of space!

Thus it is, that here in this country the experimenters and the innovators are not confined to the people in the research laboratories, the proving grounds and the factories. Everyone plays a part and everyone has a chance. It is impossible to draw any hard and fast boundary lines between the top-flight inventors, the runners-up, the amateurs, the everyday users. No such boundary lines have a chance of staying put. *Things are shifting back and forth even as this is being written.*

In America, to a greater degree than in any other country, there has been the opportunity for self-expression, self-development and advancement on the basis of merit – regardless of race, creed, or class distinction.

The recognition of the fact that the individual is a responsible human being – free and self-controlling and capable of looking after himself – has kept down the overhead of bureaucratic red tape and the cost of policing. This has made low taxes possible with the result that any enterprising person could hope to reap a good share of the fruits of any extra effort that he was willing to put forth.

Not having to worry about being robbed of his life, his liberty, or his property, the American has been free to concentrate his energies on the production of useful goods and services.

Under such conditions the habit of thrift was deeply ingrained. Instead of spending all our earnings on goods for personal consumption there have been strong incentives to save and invest.

The capital resulting from such savings made it possible to build up tremendous resources in the form of more efficient tools of production which have multiplied the effectiveness of human energy to an unbelievable degree.

Through the extra efforts of millions of people who were willing to work a little harder and willing to spend a little less than they earned, American workers have been pro-

vided with more tools and better tools than any other workers in the world, with the result that their output and wages are higher than anywhere else.

It has been estimated that our superior tool equipment (mechanical power and labor saving devices) have expanded our natural human energies to the equivalent of *one billion extra workers!*

The dreams of Sir Dudley North and Eli Whitney could never have become a practical reality except under conditions that provided incentives to save and invest.

Superior tools and equipment have not only made it possible to produce more things at lower prices – but many of the more complex products, that we have come to take for granted, simply couldn't be made at all were it not for our highly developed manufacturing facilities.

**I**N THE LAST ANALYSIS, all of these advantages are the natural, normal outgrowth of a political structure that unleashed the creative energies of millions of men and women by leaving them free to work out their own affairs – not under the lash of coercive authority, but through voluntary cooperation based on enlightened self-interest and moral responsibility.

That's why plows are now made of steel.

That's why America has led the world in production accomplishments.

That's why we've been able to win wars started by nations that make a regular business of fighting.

That's why we are able to feed the victims of their pagan aggression.



And last but not least, that's why the people of the United States, who occupy only 6% of the world's land area and who represent less than 7% of the world's population, own:

- 85% of the world's automobiles*
- 60% of the life insurance policies*
- 54% of the telephones*
- 48% of the radio sets*
- 46% of the electric power capacity*
- 35% of the world's railway mileage*
- 30% of the improved highways*
- 92% of the modern bathtubs.*

Before the war Americans consumed:


- 75% of the world's silk*
- 60% of the world's rubber*
- 50% of the world's coffee*
- 40% of the world's salt.*

The last item may sound a bit trivial. I was tempted to leave it out but some of my economist friends tell me that *the use of salt is one of the best indications of a nation's production and general standard of living.*

Taking that statement at its face value, leads to the startling conclusion that the people of the United States are exactly nine times better off than the average people in the rest of the world!

## CHAPTER 20

# Moral ~~versus~~<sup>plus</sup> Material



The **THIRD ATTEMPT** to set men free has made the great grandchildren of the Revolutionary leaders the best fed, the best clothed, the best housed and the most prosperous people on the face of the globe. Many of the things that we have come to take for granted as commonplace necessities of life would have been beyond the fondest dreams of luxury-seeking kings and potentates of a few years ago.

Perhaps I'm laying too much stress on material accomplishments, as against the cultural and moral aspects, but I can't see that there are any clean cut dividing lines.

It is generally agreed that the necessities of life must be taken care of before there can be any widespread progress in other and more important directions. But I'd like to suggest that the interrelations are far deeper and *that neither the chicken nor the egg comes first.*

America's outstanding progress in the realm of material things is the *result* of an approach that was based on sound moral principles – an approach that threw aside the pagan superstition of a static universe and which admits no limitations to man's progress so long as he directs his imaginative abilities and creative faculties in harmony with *Truth* and *Rightness.*

Consider the futile efforts of the ancient alchemist who, laboring under the delusion that things were governed by the whims and fancies of the mythical gods, attempted to

change the nature of materials *in the mass* by waving his magic wand and uttering his mystical incantations.

His intentions were good but his beliefs were false, and progress was at a standstill until the modern research worker reversed the procedure.

In contrast to the ancient alchemist, he delves into the secrets of the molecule and the atom – working from the specific back to the general, with the abiding faith that there is no limit to what can be accomplished so long as man conforms his plans to The Higher Plan that governs all things.

The same principle applies in the fields of industry and commerce.

America's accomplishments in quantity production and the widespread distribution of complex products and services would not have been possible except through the voluntary cooperation of free individuals.

Voluntary cooperation depends on the observance of ethical standards – based on the recognition of human rights, human obligations and individual responsibility. It's a practical manifestation of the brotherhood of man *and it's good business*.

To rely on force and coercion – courts of law and police regulation – is too expensive. It slows things down, adds too much to the overhead, and saps energy that might otherwise be directed to the production of greater abundance.

In the static world of the pagans, the only way to gain a benefit was to *take something away from someone else*. Under that philosophy, human energy that might have been used to *increase* wealth has always been wasted in *fighting over existing wealth*.

It's been going on for thousands upon thousands of years and, in the process, material wealth has been destroyed, human energy has been dissipated and desolation has prevailed.

Then, here in America, after 160 years of voluntary co-

operation between free individuals, we have pointed the way to a world of peace and plenty. Although we've just barely reached the threshold, we've gone far enough *to disprove the age-old superstition that for one person to make a profit – the other must suffer a loss.*

Under the American formula the soundness of the Golden Rule becomes increasingly apparent and for the first time in the history of the world we have witnessed the paradox of higher wages, lower prices, more things for more people – and we're only just getting started !

NOT PERFECT – *BUT* . . . .

It is true that America is far from perfect, and being a self-critical and progressive people we find it easy to visualize a much better world.

But in admitting our shortcomings and laying our plans to overcome them there are three questions that might well be asked:

1. To what degree are our shortcomings traceable to the form of political structure under which our country was founded ?
2. To what degree are they due to drifting *away* from that concept ?
3. How does our record compare with those countries which have tried to operate under the opposite philosophy ?

*And in drawing the comparisons it's important to bear in mind that we've been at it less than 200 years as against thousands of years of experience with various forms of regimentation.*

## COUNTER-REVOLUTIONISTS

Today we hear a lot of talk to the effect that our original form of government has been outmoded – that it's old fashioned and needs to be brought up to date – that you can't resist the trend of history – and that we are now in the

midst of a *new* world revolution.

But the truth of the matter is that the American Revolution for human freedom is the only thing that's *really* new – and it did not end with the surrender of Cornwallis or the signing of the Constitution.

It's still going on, and the counter-revolutionists – *the enemies of freedom* – are on the march.

Their major attack is not on the open battle front. It is the fifth column technique of skillfully boring from within – a program of infiltration and attrition.

The principal secret weapon is traceable to Lenin who instructed his followers to “first confuse the vocabulary.”

Lenin was smart. He knew that thinking can be done *only in words* – and that *accurate* thinking requires words of *precise meaning*.

Confuse the vocabulary and the unsuspecting majority is at a disadvantage against the small but highly disciplined minority who know exactly what they want and who deliberately promote word-confusion as a first step in their efforts to divide and conquer.

Lenin was an able strategist and his instructions have borne fruit.

There are evidences of it on every side – with the result that the communication of logical thought has become increasingly difficult and today we are living in a world of sugar-coated fallacies, cliches, false meanings and double-talk.

**O**FFHAND one would assume that free Americans, with an unprecedented record of progress, would be completely immune to the propaganda of those who advocate a reversion to pagan ideology.

But paradoxically people who have lived their lives in a civilization founded on Christian ethics are at a serious dis-



advantage when it comes to defending themselves against the surreptitious tactics of those who deny all moral values – and who are obsessed with the immoral fallacy that “the end justifies the means.”

As Henry J. Taylor has expressed it, the best prize fighter, accustomed to following the boxing rules, is not invulnerable against an opponent who carries lead in his gloves and who has no compunction about hitting below the belt.

We in America are up against the problem of protecting ourselves against the jujitsu tactics of those who would have us commit suicide by using our own strength to destroy the very things that are responsible for that strength.

Without regard for moral principles of decency and fair play, their techniques are skillfully designed to take advantage of our virtues and turn them into weaknesses.

Our habit of self-criticism, which is so largely responsible for our progress, makes us particularly vulnerable to distorted propaganda which exaggerates our deficiencies and holds out false promises of a short-cut to the millenium.

*Thus it is, that some of our most patriotic, high-minded and well-meaning citizens succumb to the overtures of those who would make them the innocent tools of subversion.*

The fact that we are a progressive and open-minded people – always on the alert for new ideas – makes us susceptible to old ideas, when attractively camouflaged and presented as something new.

Being a gracious, tolerant and fair-minded people, we are inclined to consider both sides of every question. That’s all right up to a point, but when it comes to the eternal verities of moral truth, *there are no two sides to the question.*

**Right is right and wrong is wrong – and any concessions to the pagan viewpoint, whether in the name of expediency or open-mindedness, pave the way for the destruction of all moral values.**

I repeat that America is far from perfect. It would be easy to write a whole book on the negative aspects, but in recent years that side has been so overstressed that I make no apologies for concentrating on the doughnut instead of the hole – and on any honest basis of comparison the record of America speaks for itself.

Here in this Republic, less than 7% of the earth's population has created more *new* wealth than all the other 2,010,000,000 people in the rest of the world – *and the benefits of this great wealth have been more widely distributed than in any other country – or at any other time.*

In addition to, or rather *as a result of* such accomplishments, we have more churches, more schools, more libraries, more recreational facilities, more hospitals.

Americans have gone further than any other people in the elimination of abusive child labor practices, the reduction of back-breaking drudgery, the spread of literacy, enlightenment, health, longevity, general well-being and goodwill toward others.

Ours is the only continent on which there has never been a general famine. Aside from the early settlers, few people in America have ever gone hungry.

Even in the depths of our worst depression, Americans on relief were living better than most of the fully employed in other countries.

There is more laughter and more song in these United States than anywhere else on earth.

In shops, streets, factories, elevators, on highways and on farms – everywhere, Americans are a most friendly and kindly people – responsive to every rumor of distress.

Someone in America will always divide his food or share his gasoline or his tire tool with the person in need.

*It would seem that insecurity, the price of freedom, has bred a degree of human sympathy that is without parallel in the history of mankind.*

It is only in America that rank and file citizens, over and over again, have made millions of small sacrifices in order to pour wealth over the rest of the world, and relieve suffering in such faraway places as Armenia, Russia, China and Japan.

With the shortest working hours on earth, we have greater *opportunities* for self-improvement and personal advancement.

But please note that the emphasis is on the word *opportunities*. The matter of taking advantage of the opportunities is up to the individual – and it cannot be otherwise.

There are no substitutes for self-faith, self-reliance, self-development, individual effort and personal responsibility.

Life on this earth is no bed of roses. The end of man is not self-indulgence – *but achievement*. There are no shortcuts, *and no substitutes for WORK*.

Human life came to be on this planet and aspires to advance in the face of conflict, struggle, pain and death.

In the last analysis, no person's security can exceed his own self-reliance and when anyone denies this self-evident truth, the chances are that he has for too long depended on someone else to do his fighting for him.

If down through the ages, men and women really worth living, hadn't stood up to the job of living – if they hadn't taken risks, faced dangers, suffered exhaustion beyond exhaustion, and kept on fighting *and working* in the one thin hope of victory – then there would be no human being left to tell the story.

***Living is a tough job. Only good fighters can make a go of it. The tragedy is that we should waste our energies in fighting one another instead of fighting the common enemies of all mankind which are famine, pestilence, disease and other destructive forces of the non-human world.***

## CHAPTER 21

# Freedom *versus* War



*Under the pagan fallacy of a static universe in which new wealth cannot be created, the only way to gain an advantage is to take something away from someone else.*

When men are free they soon learn that wars of aggression against other people are unprofitable. They find that human energies are far more productive when applied to the peaceful pursuits of creating and exchanging useful goods and services. But when war is forced

upon them, they always give a good account of themselves.

The reasons are not far to seek:

FIRST – Military strength rests on a foundation of economic strength.

SECOND – Economic strength depends on the number of people who are engaged in productive work – as against the number being supported on public payrolls.

THIRD – Free individuals have greater initiative. They are more ingenious and more resourceful in adapting themselves to the emergencies of war and matching wits against the aggressors – *from a military standpoint as well as from a technological standpoint.*

FOURTH – They have more to fight for and do not need to be egged on by spurious propaganda.

From Genghis Khan to Adolf Hitler, the standard practice in the Old World has been to appropriate the goods of others through the use of brute force – supported with propaganda designed to justify their aggression by scaring their subjects into believing that they are surrounded by enemies who are about to attack.

Under their gods of superstition – the Will-of-the-Swarm, the Despots, the Dictators and the Fuehrers – the peoples of Europe and Asia have made almost uninterrupted war since the beginning of history. During the past thirty centuries, for example, only one year out of fifteen has been free from war, and even in the brief intervals of peace, the preparation for war has sapped energy that might otherwise have been directed toward constructive pursuits.

Imagine what kind of world this would be if the energies of *all* its 2,150,000,000 people were taken off of war efforts, freed from bureaucratic regimentation, and applied to the invention, production and exchange of useful goods and services.

Down through the ages, human beings have always tried to stop war by utterly crushing the enemy. There has been no progress for the simple reason that *the underlying cause of war is NOT the enemy.*

Combat on the field of battle is merely the symptom. War is caused by a false notion of human energy based on the ancient superstition that men and women should be reduced to the status of the beehive.

When the majority of people on this earth come to realize that they are free, self-controlling, responsible for their own acts and for their relationships with others – then there will be no wars.

Until that job is done America must continue to take the lead against the forces of paganism – in times of peace as well as in times of actual war.

We've always given a good account of ourselves on the battlefield – and we've played an important role as the Arsenal of Democracy – or rather I should say, as the *Arsenal of FREEDOM*.

The victims of paganism always look to America for help in fighting off their aggressors. And it is America that always plays the major role in helping its friends (as well as its enemies) get back on their feet.

But there are definite limits as to how far we can go *and keep on going* in that direction.

*Maybe we would be doing the peoples of the world a greater and more enduring service, if along with each item of food, clothing, money and equipment, we sent a simple, matter-of-fact statement of the reasons underlying our ability to make contributions so far out of proportion to our population and our natural resources.*

And I rather like the idea from another standpoint:

*In the role of salesmen for America, perhaps we would become more appreciative of our own product – more steadfast in holding to the faith of our fathers, more alert in resisting the alluring promises of false Utopias which for over 6,000 years have kept the vast majority of people under-fed, under-clothed, embroiled in wars and surrounded by famine, pestilence and human degradation.*

. . . FINIS . . .

## APPENDIX

## Author's Notation

Although a businessman, rather than a scholar or writer, I am much interested in the grassroots aspects of human progress and for some years I've had the feeling that certain important, but lesser known books, deserved to be rewritten, brought up-to-date and published in streamlined editions for people who don't have much time to read.

"MAINSRING" is a first attempt in that general direction.

In some respects it is a condensation of Rose Wilder Lane's book "The Discovery of Freedom". In other respects it is an *amplification*. Inspired by her thesis and with her gracious consent, I've tried to retell her story in my own way, making liberal use of her material—plus ideas growing out of personal experiences and gathered from various sources.\*

Also, I have greatly benefitted from the help, advice and criticism of friends, and special acknowledgment is made to Laurence Freeburn, Rex Tullsen, Loren B. Miller, Dr. Vervon Orval Watts and to my good friend William O'Brien—gentleman, scholar, philosopher and *catalytic collaborator*.

If MAINSPRING meets with reasonable reception, I plan as time goes on, to do the same sort of thing with other books.

For example, I'd like to reinterpret the writings of Frederic Bastiat in the language of today and from the American viewpoint. I'd like to develop a dramatization of the all-but-forgotten Federalist Papers. Also, I'd like to publish a highspot condensation of "Yankee Hobo in the Orient" by John Patric of Frying Pan Creek, Oregon. (It's not only a fascinating narrative but a great book on political economy.)

Since this experimental venture is undertaken more or less as a personal hobby, and in order to keep it divorced from my regular work, I have organized a little company to handle the business end.

While I realize that for a writer (or even a rewriter) to finance the printing of his own works is inconsistent with orthodox practice in the publishing field, it seems entirely CONSISTENT with the philosophy of individual freedom which "MAINSRING" attempts to present.

—h. g. w.

---

\* As stated on the title page, Mrs. Lane should not be blamed for any omissions, deviations and additions. (She does not always agree with me—and vice versa!) Her original book "The Discovery of Freedom" (which delves much deeper into certain phases of the subject) is published in a 262-page, cloth-bound library edition by The John Day Company, 2 West 45th Street, New York 19, N. Y. (\$2.50)



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The mere mention of books that have been used for reference purposes and as stimulants to thought, can indicate only a small part of one's obligation to those who have specialized in areas so vast as those touched upon in MAINSPRING.

As will be noted, the list includes some items that are opposed to the philosophy of individual freedom and which are not recommended—except for anti-toxin effects.\*

James Truslow Adams—*The Living Jefferson*—Scribner, 1936.

William Henry Davenport Adams—*Warriors of the Crescent* (1892)—Appleton.

Ameer Ali—*Short History of the Saracens* (1943)—Macmillan.

Matthew Page Andrews—*Social Planning by Frontier Thinkers* (1944)—Richard R. Smith, N. Y. C.

John R. Baker—See page 209n.

Charles Bancroft—*Footprints of Time and Analysis of our American Government* (1876)—R. T. Root Pub. Co., Washington, D. C.

Willis J. Ballinger—*By Vote of the People*—Scribner, 1946.

Frederic Bastiat—See page 29.

Charles A. Beard—*A Basic History of the U. S.* (1944)—Doubleday Doran. *The Rise of American Civilization* (with Mary R. Beard, 1937)—Macmillan. *Century of Progress* (Editor, 1932) Harper.

Hilaire Belloc—*The Crusades* (1937)—Bruce Pub. Co., Milwaukee. *The Crises of Civilization* (1937)—Fordham University Press. *Great Heresies* (1938)—Sheed and Ward, Inc., N. Y. C.

Christy Borth—*Pioneers of Plenty* (1939)—*Masters of Mass Production* (1945)—Bobbs-Merrill.

Thomas A. Boyd—*Research, the Pathfinder of Science and Industry* (1935)—Appleton-Century.

Irving Brant—*James Madison, The Virginia Revolutionist* (1941)—Bobbs-Merrill.

J. B. Brebner—*Explorers of North America 1492-1806*—Macmillan, 1933.

Héiry Thomas Buckle—See page 50ff.

Jacob Burckhardt—*Force and Freedom* (1943)—Pantheon Books Inc., N. Y. C.

Roger Burlingame—*Engines of Democracy* (1940)—*March of the Iron Men* (1942)—Scribner.

James Burnham—*The Managerial Revolution* (1941)—*Struggle for the World* (1947)—John Day.

John W. Burgess—*Reconciliation of Government with Liberty* (1915)—Scribner.

Edward Byng—*World of the Arabs* (1941)—Little, Brown.

Mary T. Carroll—*The Man Who Dared to Care* (1942)—Longmans, Green.

Thomas Nixon Carver—*Essays in Social Justice* (1915)—Harvard University Press.

Ellen Chase—*The Beginnings of the American Revolution*—Baker & Taylor, N.Y.C. 1910.

Fred G. Clark — *Magnificent Delusion* (1940)—Whittlesey House. *How We Live* —(with Richard Stanton Rimanoczy)—D. Van Nostrand, 1944.

Victor S. Clark—*History of Manufacture in the U. S.*, Vol. 1 (1929)—McGraw-Hill.

Henry Steele Commager with Samuel Eliot Morison—*Growth of the American Republic* (3rd Edition) (1942)—Oxford University Press.

Harriet C. Cooper — *James Oglethorpe* (1904)—D. Appleton & Co.

J. H. S. Crevecoeur—*Letters from an American Farmer Describing Customs of the British Colonies in North America*—London, 1782.

Carl Crow—See page 180.

Samuel Crowther—*Time to Inquire* (1942)—John Day.

William Dampier—*A History of Science* (1943)—Macmillan.

Carl Van Doren—*Benjamin Franklin* (1938)—Viking Press.

Peter F. Drucker—*The Future of Industrial Man* (1942)—John Day.

Seymour Dunbar—*History of Travel in America* (1915)—Tudor Pub. Co., N.Y.C.

Lecomte du Noüy—*Human Destiny* (1947)—Longmans, Green.

Will Durant—*The Life of Greece* (1939)—Simon & Schuster.

Sterling Edwin Edmunds — *Struggle for Freedom* (1946)—Bruce Pub. Co., Milwaukee.

\* "They also serve, who only irritate"

? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?

- Jonathan Elliott—*Debates on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* (1896)—J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.
- Martin Fischer—*Gracian's Manual on the Art of Worldly Wisdom*, (translation, 1934). In *Praise of Man* (1943)—Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill.
- John T. Flynn — *As We Go Marching* (1944)—Doubleday, Doran.
- Ebenezer Fox—See page 152ff.
- Sir James Frazer — *Golden Bough*—Macmillan, 1930.
- Claud E. Fuller—*The Whitney Firearms* (1946)—Standard Publications, Inc., Huntington, W. Va.
- Garet Garrett — *The Revolution Was* (Pamphlet, 1944)—Caxton Printers, Ltd., Caldwell, Idaho.
- José Ortega y Gasset—*The Revolt of the Masses* (1932)—W. W. Norton & Co.
- Harry David Gideonse—*Organized Society and Public Policy* (pamphlet, 1939)—University of Chicago Press.
- Arthur Gilman—*Story of the Saracens* (1891)—Putnam.
- Henry Woodfin Grady—See page 132ff.
- Hanbury Hankin—*Common Sense and Its Cultivation* (1926)—E. P. Dutton.
- Edward Rochie Hardy, Jr.,—*Militant in Earth* (1940)—Oxford University Press.
- Floyd A. Harper—*Freedom and Enterprise* (Pamphlet, 1945)—Privately printed by H. W. Peters, 12141 Charlevoix Avenue, Detroit.
- Joel Chandler Harris—*Stories of Georgia* (1896)—American Book Company, N.Y.C.
- Friedrich A. Hayek—*The Road to Serfdom*—University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Henry Hazlitt—*Economics in One Easy Lesson*—Harper, 1946.
- Adolf Hitler—*Mein Kampf*—Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940.
- Lancelot Hogben—*Science for the Citizen* (1938)—Knopf.
- Hjalmar Holand—See page 110.
- Stewart H. Holbrook—*Lost Men of American History* (1946)—Macmillan.
- Walter Houghton—*Kings of Fortune* (1888)—Loomis National Library Assn., Chicago.
- E. W. Howe—*Ventures in Common Sense* (1921)—Knopf.
- Betty Knowles Hunt—*Show Me Any Other Country* (Pamphlet)—The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y., 1947.
- Bernard Jaffe—*Men of Science in America* (1944)—Simon & Schuster.
- Alexander H. Japp — *Master Missionaries* (1881)—Robert Carter & Bros., N. Y. C.
- Waldemar Kaempffert (Editor)—*A Popular History of American Inventions* (1924)—Scribner.
- C. Kay-Scott (Frederick Creighton Wellman)—*Life Is Too Short*—Lippincott, 1943.
- C. F. Keary—*Vikings in Western Christendom* (1891)—Putnam.
- Lucian Lamar Knight—*Georgia's Landmarks, Memorials and Legends* (1913)—The Byrd Printing Co., Atlanta, Ga.
- Harold Lamb—See page 92.
- Rose Wilder Lane—*The Discovery of Freedom*—John Day Company, N. Y. C., 1943.
- Give Me Liberty* (pamphlet) published by Lew Ney, 132 Christopher St., N.Y.C., (1945).
- T. E. Lawrence—*Seven Pillars of Wisdom* (1926)—Doubleday, 1935.
- Henry Cabot Lodge—*The Works of Alexander Hamilton*—Putnam, 1904.
- Octavia Walton LeVert—*Souvenirs of Travel* (1857)—S. H. Goetzel & Co., N. Y. C.
- Henry C. Link—*Return to Religion* (1936)—*Rediscovery of Man* (1938)—Macmillan. *Rediscovery of Morals* (1947)—E. P. Dutton.
- Walter Lippmann — *The Good Society* (1943)—Little, Brown & Co.
- Charles Mackay—*Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (1841)—L. C. Page & Co., Boston (1932).
- Karl Marx—*Capital* (1867)—*Communist Manifesto* (with Friedrich Engels, 1847)—Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago 10, Ill.
- Henri Masse—*Islam*—translated from the French by Halide-Edib—Putnam, 1938.
- Charles Howard McIlwain—*Constitutionalism, Ancient and Modern*—Cornell University Press, 1940.
- Carl McIntire—*Rise of the Tyrant* (1945)—Christian Beacon Press, Collingswood, N. J.
- Henry L. Mencken—*A New Dictionary of Quotations* (1942)—Knopf. *Men versus the Man* (with Robert R. LeMonte, 1910)—Henry Holt & Co., N.Y.C.
- John Chester Miller—*Origins of the American Revolution*—Little, Brown, 1943.
- Ludwig von Mises—*Bureaucracy* (1944)—Yale University Press. *Planned Chaos* (1947)—The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y.
- Samuel Eliot Morison—See page 113.
- Gaetano Mosca—*The Ruling Class* (1895)—McGraw-Hill, 1939.
- Benito Mussolini — *My Autobiography* — Scribner, 1928.
- David Saville Muzzey—See page 131.
- Albert Jay Nock—*Our Enemy the State*—Caxton Printers, Ltd., Caldwell, Idaho.
- Thomas James Norton—*The Constitution of the United States—its Sources and its Applications* (1946)—America's Future, Inc., 210 E. 43rd St., New York City.
- Frank J. Oliver—*The Machine Tool Primer* (1943)—The Herbert D. Hall Foundation, 99 Lincoln Park, Newark, N. J.

- F. S. Oliver—*The Endless Adventure*—Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.
- Isabel Paterson—*The God of the Machine* (See page 26.) Putnam, 1943.
- John Patric—*Yankee Hobo in the Orient*. (See page 230.) Published by the author at Frying Pan Creek, Florence, Ore. 1945.
- Samuel Pettengill—*Jefferson, the Forgotten Man* (1938)—America's Future, Inc., 210 E. 43rd St., N.Y.C.
- Henri Pirenne—*Mohammed and Charlemagne*—W. W. Norton, 1939.
- Walter B. Pitkin—*A Short Introduction to the History of Human Stupidity* (only 586 pages!)—Simon & Schuster, 1932.
- John J. Pool—*Studies in Mohammedanism* (1892)—Archibald Constable & Co., London, Eng.
- Arthur Pound—*The Iron Man in Industry* (1922)—Atlantic Monthly Press.
- E. P. Prentice—*Hunger and History* (1939)—Harper.
- Edgar Monsanto Queeny—*The Spirit of Enterprise* (1943)—Scribner.
- Leonard E. Read—*Pattern for Revolt* (pamphlet, 1945)—Register Publishing Co., Santa Ana, Calif.
- George Washington Robnett—*Can We Preserve Our American System in the Post-War World?*—National Laymen's Council, 53 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill.
- Franklin Delano Roosevelt—*Public Papers and Addresses*—Random House, 1938.
- Allen Rucker—*Labor's Road to Plenty* (1937)—L. C. Page & Co., Boston.
- Bertrand Russell—*Mysticism and Logic* (1929)—W. W. Norton.
- A. W. Ryder (translator)—*Bhagavad-Gita* (1929)—University of Chicago Press.
- Samuel Shellabarger—See page 108.
- Harry Scherman—*The Promises Men Live By*—Random House, 1938.
- Henry C. Simons—*A Positive Program for Laissez Faire* (Public Policy Pamphlets, 1934)—University of Chicago Press.
- Adam Smith—*The Wealth of Nations* (1776)—E. P. Dutton & Co.
- Carl Snyder—*Capitalism the Creator* (1940)—Macmillan.
- W. H. Sparks—*The Memories of Fifty Years* (1870)—Claxon, Remsen & Hoffelinger, Philadelphia.
- John R. Spears—*American Slave-Trade* (1900)—Scribner.
- Oswald Spengler—*The Decline of the West* (Atkinson translation)—Knopf, 1932.
- Sir Josiah Stamp—*Motive & Method in a Christian Order* (1936)—Abingdon Press, N.Y.C.
- Vilhjalmur Stefansson—*Great Adventures and Explorations*. (See pages 109, 110.) The Dial Press, N.Y.C., 1947.
- Alexander H. Stephens—*Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States* (1868)—National Pub. Co., Philadelphia.
- William Graham Sumner—*Folkways* (1906)—Ginn & Co. *The Forgotten Man* (pamphlet)—Yale University Press (1918).
- Frederick Winslow Taylor—*The Principles of Scientific Management* (1911)—Harper, 1916.
- Henry J. Taylor—*Men in Motion* (1943)—Doubleday, Doran. *Men and Power* (1946)—Dodd, Mead.
- E. L. Thorndike—*Human Nature and the Social Order* (1940)—Macmillan.
- John K. Turner—*Challenge to Karl Marx* (1941)—Reynal & Hitchcock.
- Abbott P. Usher—*History of Mechanical Inventions* (1929)—McGraw-Hill.
- Hamilton Vreeland—*Twilight of Individual Liberty* (1944)—Scribner.
- Henry Agard Wallace—*The American Choice*—Reynal & Hitchcock, 1940.
- Vervon Orval Watts—*Why Are We So Prosperous?* (1938)—Burgess Publishing Co., Minneapolis. *Do We Want Free Enterprise?* (1944) Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.
- Willis Mason West—*Modern World, from Charlemagne to the Present Time* (1915)—Allyn & Bacon, Boston.
- Laura Ingalls Wilder—*The Little House Series*—comprising eight volumes of books for children but which are also good for grown-ups. Taken collectively they are a remarkable grassroots story of American frontier life.—Harper.
- W. E. Woodward—*Tom Paine, America's Godfather* (1945)—E. P. Dutton.
- W. H. Woodward—*Short History of the Expansion of the British Empire* (1899)—Cambridge University Press.
- Robert Wright—*Memoir of General James Oglethorpe* (1867)—Chapman & Hall, London, Eng.
- Samuel S. Wyer, 1325 Cambridge Blvd., Columbus 8, Ohio—privately printed pamphlets including: *Shift of Civilization* (1929)—*Struggle for Bill of Rights* (1945)—*America's Opportunity for Greatness* (1946).
- Hans Zinsser—*Rats, Lice and History* (1935)—Little, Brown.

Encyclopaedia Britannica (14th Edition 1929)—Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., N. Y. C.

Great Events by Famous Historians—(United Empire Edition, 20 Vols.)—The National Alumni, London, Eng., 1905.

## a word about the type

THE MAIN TEXT of this book was set in *Intertype Century Extended* – a direct descendant of *Century Roman* which was originally cut in the year 1895 by L. B. Benton under the direction of Theodore Low DeVinne.

DeVinne is generally regarded as one of the greatest craftsmen in the printing arts that America has produced. His busy plant turned out the old *St. Nicholas Magazine* – also *Scribner's Magazine*, *Century Dictionary* and *Century Magazine*, for which the new type was designed – and named.

Although he lived in an age of frills and furbelows, DeVinne was a staunch champion of functional art. In contrast to most of his contemporaries (including the great William Morris) DeVinne looked upon a book as something to be read – instead of merely looked at and he insisted that printing type should be designed for easy legibility instead of decorative effects.

Century type was a reflection of DeVinne's convictions and has been likened unto a busy and efficient workman dressed in denim.

During the past fifty years, the original design has been modified and the legibility further improved. But with the modern demand for more words in less space, it has lost popularity among the publishers of magazines and books – except in the children's field where ease of reading is still recognized as more important than space-saving economy or superfluous artistry.

It was for these reasons that *Century* was chosen as an appropriate type for printing the book *Mainspring* – which was produced in the plants of the  
J. W. Clement Company  
Buffalo, N. Y.



COMMERCIAL



*If You Should Want*

## ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS BOOK

MAINSRING should be available at your bookstore, but if you have any trouble getting it locally, just fill out, detach, and mail the order blank below and they will be sent postage prepaid.

-----

**TALBOT BOOKS, 6432 CASS AVE., DETROIT 2, MICH.**

I am enclosing \$ 1.00 for one copy of MAINSRING

5.00 for six copies of MAINSRING

10.00 for 12 copies of MAINSRING

*If in Canada, add 20% to the above prices.*



Form of Remittance: Money Order  Draft  Check


Name .....  
*please "print"*

Address .....

City .....  
Postal Zone No. or R.F.D. Route

State .....



A black and white illustration of a city skyline with a large speech bubble containing a quote. The city features various architectural styles, including a tall skyscraper, a bridge, and a large dome. In the foreground, two indigenous people are shown in a cave-like setting, one kneeling and the other sitting, both looking at a small fire. The background shows a body of water with several boats, including a large steamship and a smaller sailboat. A road with a bus and a car is visible on the right side of the image. The overall style is reminiscent of mid-20th-century graphic design.

"Today we study the day before yesterday,  
in order that yesterday may not paralyze  
today, and that today may not cloud our  
vision of tomorrow." —WILLIAM MAITLAND